T. S. Eliot's Voice:
A Cultural History

Submitted by Elizabeth Joan Micaković to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in English
In January 2015

Signature: ……..

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) for providing the funding for the studentship that culminated in this doctoral thesis.

A number of individuals have generously leant their expertise to and guided the development of this thesis from its inception, including: Prof. Mark Whalan (now of University of Oregon), Dr. Vike Plock, Dr. Jason Hall and Dr. Jo Gill at the University of Exeter. In addition, I have benefitted considerably from the input and advice from a number of T. S. Eliot scholars from both sides of the Atlantic, not least from Jim McCue and the members of the T. S. Eliot Society. To all those above who have generously given their time and their patience, I extend my gratitude.

I would also like to thank the examiners of this thesis, Dr. Jason Harding and Dr. Peter Riley, for their insightful and careful suggestions on how this thesis might be improved and developed further.

The genesis of this thesis has not been without its challenges, and I have been blessed with the support and kindness of two individuals in particular who have ensured that it came to fruition: Dr. Laura Salisbury, my supervisor for this project who generously provided strength and moral support when I needed it most, and Prof. Karen Edwards, a mentor and wonderful friend. To both I am truly indebted.

Finally, I would be nowhere without the love and support of my family and close friends, in particular Sarah Barrett who provided me with comfort and safety when I needed it most, and whose humour and kindness kept me going through my final year. Finally, to my husband who has borne as many of the pressures of this PhD as I have, I owe far more than gratitude and I can only offer my love in return. I have also been blessed, in the final stages of this project, with the company of my daughter, Danica, who was my moral support and motivation through the completion, viva and corrections process. With the completion of this PhD came her birth, and it seems fitting that as one stage of my life closes shut a new and far more exciting and fulfilling chapter should open. In helping me gain closure on one chapter and giving me so much joy and enlightenment in the next, this thesis is dedicated to her.

Abstract

This thesis is a diachronic account of T. S. Eliot's speaking voice, which, over fifty years, developed into the meticulously crafted tool of the twentieth-century author and critic and the politically and socially powerful instrument of the public intellectual. Eliot's voice, although certainly the offspring of the nineteenth-century marriage of authorship as a bona fide profession and oral performance, was, however, unique in its responsiveness to twentieth-century legal and political debates on national identity and stability, copyright, and the powerful potential of recording technologies to both disseminate an author's words almost exponentially whilst simultaneously encroaching on the traditional material of authorship: print. Indeed, what underpins this thesis is the argument that he was both fascinated by and actively involved in shaping those very discourses on the authority of the spoken voice in the belief that the power of the spoken word, and ultimately of his own voice, held an unrivalled ability to impact on social behaviour and national stability.

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis is a diachronic account of T. S. Eliot's speaking voice, which, over fifty years, developed into the meticulously crafted tool of the twentieth-century author and critic and the politically and socially powerful instrument of the public intellectual. Eliot's voice, although certainly the offspring of the nineteenth-century marriage of authorship as a bona fide profession and oral performance, was, however, unique in its responsiveness to twentieth-century legal and political debates on national identity and stability, copyright, and the powerful potential of recording technologies to both disseminate an author's words almost exponentially whilst simultaneously encroaching on the traditional material of authorship: print. Indeed, what underpins this thesis is the argument that he was both fascinated by and actively involved in shaping those very discourses on the authority of the spoken voice in the the belief that the power of the spoken word, and ultimately of his own voice, held an unrivalled ability to impact on social behaviour and national stability.

Yet, it is at the points where the voice of the literary critic and the public intellectual frequently converged – the discursive results percolating through the political, social and cultural environment – that this thesis is primarily concerned. Rarely have Eliot's essays been assessed in terms of the historical conditions in which they were written: why, for example, did Eliot turn to the Early Modern writers in his first radio broadcasts? Or why was dramatic criticism the subject of many of his lectures throughout the Second World War and the years immediately following it? Similarly, what provoked Eliot to make his first phonographic recordings at the University of Harvard and Columbia rather than in London, despite his involvement in the Ogden-Joyce recordings? The answers to these questions are, I am convinced, not rooted in mere serendipity or convenience. Rather, the direction of Eliot's criticism and the development of his literary and audio material were often responses to localised political events, many of which were frequently of immediate professional and national concern.

At this point I would like to emphasise that this is not, as is often assumed when discussing this project, an investigation into the origins of Eliot's accent. Indeed, tell scholars that you're working on the history of Eliot's voice, and one is instantly made the auditor of either praise or indictments of his speaking voice on which one is expected to be arbiter. This thesis is not a critical evaluation of Eliot's

voice nor, as is frequently assumed, will it address whether he had an English or American accent. Valid as those questions may (or not) be, they cannot be answered satisfactorily with any factual evidence to support a definitive conclusion one way or another, and they certainly could not account for a thesis-length project.[1] Instead, this is an historical account of how he came to understand the spoken voice as a powerful catalyst for social change as well as one of the most lucrative and powerful assets of a "modern" framework for authorship. This in and of itself is not an original assertion: the narrative of how he came to this conclusion, however, is.

Voice in scholarship

Scholarship into the cultural and literary history of orality has experienced something of a renaissance over the last fifteen years, and much of this research has demonstrated a clear genealogy of thought that dates back, in the twentieth-century at least, to Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* (1916). Since Saussure's determined intellectual disaggregation of language into its separate components of speech and language, voice studies, or approaches to understanding the voice, have variously ranged from philosophical questions of intention to sociological and cultural ideas on power and authority. Indeed, Saussure's articulation that speech is "many-sided and heterogeneous", belonging "both to the individual and to society" had an explosive effect on the study of speech and language not only in those social and human sciences that he stresses in his work – anthropology, psychology, and so forth – but on the cultural perception and reinvigoration of the spoken word as an authoritative medium.

---

[1] Nevertheless, such questions have shaped the very receptiveness of the public to Eliot as a cultural and intellectual authority. As the first volume of Eliot's letters attest, there was no shortage of criticism or commentary on that alien voice which appeared to transgress the geographical rules of vocal identity. Virginia Woolf famously referred to the 'polished, cultivated, elaborate young American, talking so slow, that each word seems to have special finish allotted it' (Bell 1977, 217), whilst Leonard Woolf likewise described Eliot's recitative voice as a 'drone' (Spotts 1989, 551). Similarly, Eliot scholars and biographers are prone to pick up on, though not develop, his contemporaries' observations of his curious voice. Carole Seymour-Jones, for instance, refers to Eliot's failed attempt to impress the literary hostess Ottoline Morrell: 'Eliot was at pains to suppress any traces of his hybrid American accent, but, despite his erudition, his carefully enunciated English sounded false to Ottoline' (Seymour-Jones 2001, 137). Lyndall Gordon speaks of his 'slow procession of scrupulously selected words, rather toneless, but carrying the breath of godlike authority' (Gordon, Eliot's New Life 1988, 191).

It is to Saussure's most famous intellectual progeny, Walter Ong, however that philosophical enquiries into voice emerging over the last thirty years have owed their inheritance, in particular from the canonical 1982 work *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. Ong himself stresses the indebtedness of his ideas to the freedom Saussure brokered for oral speech in his most famous work. For Saussure's theory, according to Ong, not only recalled to the scholarly mind the primacy of oral speech, but it also revealed an almost lazy assumption – a "persistent tendency" – amongst scholars that writing was a *prima facie* foundation of language. It was Saussure's conviction that, as Ong understood it, writing was "a kind of complement to oral speech, not as a transformer of verbalization" that released oral speech from its dependent relationship on language for its longevity, allowing Ong to make the powerful assertion that "[t]he basic orality of language is permanent".[2]

Although Ong does not dispute the capacity and power of the written word to transform oral dialects into grapholects, which can transcend multiple dialectical boundaries and transform social thought through a shared "deep commitment to writing", the spoken word remains "the natural habitat of language". The spoken word may be ephemeral – tempered by the swift evolution in expression to which the written word, anchored by its script, is less susceptible – but unlike its written counterpart it can exist autonomously from inscription. Indeed, whilst written texts are temporally anchored for longer through the comparatively slow evolution of the grapholect, and whilst the celerity of change in oral expression is the catalyst for its ephemerality, Ong hints at the power of the oral to encapsulate a moment, an expression, or a thought in the modern world. The oral word is not subject to that need to "conver[t]" inscription into sound either imaginatively or aurally, where, in comparison, the written is consumed "sketchily in the rapid reading common to high-technology cultures".[3] The ephemerality of the spoken word creates a greater inclination towards attentive listening.

It is in Ong's insistence on the totalizing experience of sound, where the individual can situate himself at "the center of my auditory world, which envelopes me, establishing me at a kind of core of sensation and existence", that he maintains

---

[2] Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Methuen, 1982), 5-7.
[3] Ong, 7-8.

endows in the spoken word an unrivalled power to hold an audience.[4] This power, he concedes, has been gradually corroded by the introduction of print in the fifteenth century, which "locks words into position".[5] Cultural orality had emerged out of a community, from the recitations of Homer to the popular readings of literary works in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but this community, as the historian David Vincent argues in *Literacy and Popular Culture*. *England 1750-1914* (1989), was itself becoming strained by emerging mass literacy. If, as Ong suggests, an individual can immerse himself entirely in sound, orality was still a communal phenomenon that was being corroded by the "solitary activities" of reading and writing.[6] Indeed, for Vincent, this sense of community was not only contingent upon the mnemonic channels of "preservation and reproduction of information by speech", but this mnemonic potential was the cornerstone around which structures of authority were legitimized, "with those who remembered the most claiming precedence over those with the most to learn".[7]

These "informal" methods of establishing authority, however, were easily dwarfed by the complex and esoteric principles which governed intellectual property law in the nineteenth century. Yet the codification of these principles, Vincent asserts, gave the authority of print an inflexible framework for dissemination that the oral narrative, unconstrained by technical contingencies of print, could elude. Instead of muffling the human voice, mass production of printed works liberated – "magnified" – the voices of "men and women reciting, singing, shouting, chanting, declaiming and narrating" by undermining the connection between "the faceless publisher and the soundless reader".[8] The oral performance of creative works not only persisted in a flourishing print economy, Vincent proffers, but flourished, the accessibility of popular literary works enhanced by a simultaneously emerging profession of literary performers. Such performers not only "preserved, at least partially, the communal act of interpretation which is associated with transmission in the oral tradition", but were also shaping and becoming integrated within the content of literary works.[9]

---

[4] Ong, 72.
[5] Ong, 121.
[6] David Vincent, *Literacy and Popular Culture*. *England 1750-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 19.
[7] Vincent, 19.
[8] Vincent, 201.
[9] Vincent, 203.

In Vincent's account, scholars such as John M. Picker and Ivan Kreilkamp have identified the source of authority transmitted through the voice and the complex, at times both fraught and interdependent relationship which often characterised the print and oral literary economies in the nineteenth century. However, it would be another decade before the enquiry into oral performance and its integration into the authorship profession – not merely the literary market – was fully explored. Although Vincent may have sown the first seed in arguing in light of Ong's work that "[s]peech is a common possession, whereas print is a species of private property", a more nuanced narrative of the legal standing of authorship based on an increasing appreciation of the economic and moral value of intellectual property was needed. Scholarship into the history of authorship as a legal concept, however, emerged soon after the publication of *Literacy and Popular Culture*, revealing that even this assertion of Vincent's has an uneasy application in the period that his book covers.

Indeed, creativity, whilst flourishing in the newly emerging market and amidst rising literacy rates, was becoming increasingly self-conscious, at times self-reflectively so, about the legal paradigms which defined creative works as intellectual property. Mark Rose's ground-breaking 1993 monograph *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright* dispels from the outset the belief that intellectual property is intrinsic to man's appreciation of intellectual pursuit and creativity. Far from a response to the nineteenth century predilection for mass production of literary and creative works, authorship as a legal status had its more humble origins in the fifteenth century, copyright being a "specifically modern institution, the creature of the printing press, the individualization of authorship in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance, and the development of the advanced marketplace society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries".[10] Authorship, and the legal premises which endowed that status with rights – copyright – was, as Rose's breathless syntax implies, a concept that was, up until the early twentieth century, five hundred years in the making, and which had undergone transformations under the pressure of different generations of commercial understandings of intellectual property.

Despite Rose's own stratified dating of copyright, however, his narrative begins with the institution of what is considered to be the first copyright law, the 1710 Statute of Anne. For Rose, the import of this Statute was derived both from the

[10] Mark Rose, *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 3.

introduction of a time-limit on copyright protection, and the codification of the principle that any authors, rather than just guild members, could be the legal proprietors of their own works.[11] Crucial to Rose's narrative, however, is the evolution of a progenitorial understanding of authorship during the mid-eighteenth century. Emerging initially out of Milton's *Areopagitica* was the concept of a literary creation as a gestated product of man, which, when conjoined the Lockean principle of property as inherent *in* man's "Person", qualified this creation as a genetic original. What Rose calls the "paternity trope" in literary creation, combined with a powerful legal philosophy of natural property, allowed the poet Edward Young, in *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759) to interweave the "notion of original genius into the traditional discourse of authorship, thereby producing a representation in which the originality of the work, and consequently its value, becomes dependent on the individuality of the author".[12] This embryonic axiom of original genius, the fibres of which would eventually be re-examined, manipulated, and yet relied upon by Modernist proponents of impersonality such as Eliot, Pound, and Joyce, became more than a mere scaffolding for legal frameworks of copyright in the nineteenth century. With original creation contingent upon the "individuality of the author", and with mass printing techniques effacing the unique written fingerprint of the author through infringement, voice would become an increasingly distinctive, unique, of-the-person mechanism by which an author could claim authority and genetic ownership of his text.

Yet, Rose's scholarship reveals that the legal recognition of authorship as potentially proprietary was considerably advanced of authorship as a socially and economically recognised profession. Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi's 1994 collection of essays, *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature,* was an important milestone in understanding the evolution of authorship not simply as a non-leisured profession, but, echoing Rose, as a relatively recent legal concept. For Woodmansee and Jaszi, modern authorship emerged out of a reconfigured, "reconceptualized" idea of ownership resultant not from the first legislative acknowledgment, but rather from the self-recognition of property rights intrinsic to creative works articulated through the "heroic self-presentation of

[11] Rose, 4.
[12] Rose, 121.

Romantic poets".[13] Over fifty years after the publication of Young's *Conjectures*, the Romantics are seen to be excavating the principle of original creation as yoked to "*genuine* authorship", and indeed what glimmers so much more brightly in Woodmansee and Jaszi's presentation of the lifecycle of authorship is the integrity of the author. It was, they argue, this ability not only to prove original creation but also to confirm the credentials of the author through which a creative work could "merit the law's protection".[14]

This latter observation, however, is remarkably understated and undeveloped, a springboard for further investigations into whether legal authorship as an individual process can stand up to the reality of the creative process. What is relegated, I think, to the periphery of these much needed and diverting discussions is the recognition that written documents, as testaments of "genuine authorship" and "original" output, were emerging as one of the first, if not entirely reliable documents of identity. If authorship had typically been an identifier of a particular stationers company or, just as often, sought to efface any evidence of a chirographic fingerprint through anonymity and pseudonym, with the advent of the twin concepts of genuine authorship and original creation came one of the first legal documents of identity with the potential to hold far more information about an author beyond birth, death, tax and litigation registers. Indeed, the Romantics inhabited a world where identity as much as authorship could be undermined by questions of "variation", "imitation" or "adaptation".[15] For Jaszi and Woodmansee genuine authorship was certified by the originality of the creative work, where the work itself was the guarantor of the authors authenticity, which in turn could "merit the law's protection as such".[16] The creative work, therefore, became a legal mechanism by which an author could confirm his national status: for to invoke the law was to invoke one's right as a citizen or subject of a particular jurisdiction. Moreover, Jaszi and Woodmansee's allusion to the inconsistencies shown in Wordsworth's intervention in parliamentary debates on copyright – in which he lobbied for indefinite copyright – and the perpetuation of a

---

[13] Jaszi and Woodmansee, 3.
[14] Jaszi and Woodmansee, 2-3.
[15] Jaszi and Woodmansee, 3. This is particularly pertinent given the relative infancy of the United Kingdom, the Act of Union having only been signed in 1800, and the publication of Wordsworth's essay on genuine authorship – *Essay, Supplementary to the Preface* – appearing only fifteen years later.
[16] Jaszi and Woodmansee, 3.

"misrepresentation of a collaborative creative process as a solitary, original one", citing the influence of Coleridge and his sister Dorothy, nevertheless confirm that for a considerable amount of time authorship, and the rights associated with original creation, were legally conferred upon one individual.[17] Where national identity was an unstable and somewhat unverifiable construct inimical to collaboration or natural fusion, sole authorship could be seen as a stabilising factor for a construct that was ambivalent to the culturally organic nature of the creative process.

In *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (1999), Stephen B. Dobranski returns the evolving narrative of the legal history of authorship and the publishing economy to the seventeenth-century. Identifying a sequential link between the dearth of the patronage system and the rise of a market economy in print, Dobranski concludes that only within this economic culture was "the originality and thus value of a work was predicated on the existence of a visible author".[18] Indeed, what characterises, and to some extent still characterises, the scholarship into the legal and economic histories of authorship is the determined recalibration of the period, even dates, of when authorship became quite literally a visible role. These debates owe much to the 1980 publication of Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, where Greenblatt's principle argument that the sixteenth century witnessed an "increased self-consciousness about the fashioning of human identity as a manipulable, artful process" gives way to a cultural and religious landscape fraught with anxieties over the ramifications of this process: could it provide license for deception and concealment, both in manners and speech? Greenblatt's work was ground-breaking for its unhesitant assertion that understanding a text's history involves acknowledging the complex network of cultural signifiers firing at any one time, that an author's own behaviour, the text's "expression of the codes by which behavior is shaped", and the ability of the text to critically reflect upon these codes could provide a more historically accurate and socially sensitive understanding of not only a single text, but of a network of texts. Greenblatt's approach is now second-nature to most scholars, and indeed it certainly directs the methodology of this thesis, but the significance of his research to scholars of the history of authorship is the

---

[17] Jaszi and Woodmansee, 5.
[18] Stephen B. Dobranski. *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 3.

implication that authorship itself was as much subject to self-fashioning as the world these authors replicated, a condition that reminds one of the malleable and transformative properties of authorship.[19]

Greenblatt's scholarship on the self-conscious fashioning of the self, and of authorship, in the sixteenth century has had far-reaching consequences for authorship studies over thirty years later, particularly for discussions on the construction and self-presentation of that role by authors themselves. Yet if Greenblatt's scholarship has laid the foundation for research into the self-conscious construction of authorship exercised throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such research has, in many ways, demonstrated an equally strong reaction to Foucault's 1969 landmark lecture on the need to reconfigure our understanding of the author's position in relation to his text. In "What is an Author?", Foucault advocates a critical re-evaluation of an author's "privilege", or authority, in relation to a text or network of texts. As society undergoes significant change, Foucault presciently argues that the author function itself will disappear, envisioning a shift in the perspective of authorship away from that "privileged moment of individualization in the history of ideas, knowledge, literature, philosophy, and the sciences" to a concession that authorship ("the subject") should hereon be analysed "as a variable and complex function of discourse".[20] In dismantling the assumption that an author does not "precede the works", it is the text, or discourse, which assumes authority, and, divested of the voice of the individual author, it is to the functionalised and utilitarian questions of a text's or discourse's "modes of existence" and space for multiple authorship and reconstitution that our attention should be directed.[21]

Foucault, like Barthes, indeed foresees the death of the author, but his is a process of resurrection in which the author becomes a site of enquiry, a part of the discursive fabric of the text. Moreover, there is a tendency, remarks Foucault, against the self-constructed persona of authorship later explored by Greenblatt, towards a reader-applied construction of authorship; in our contrivance of authorship, the author himself becomes an "ideological product" through which those very impediments

---

[19] See Stephen Greenblatt *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 2-8.
[20] Michel Foucault "What is an author" in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* ed. James D. Faubion. Trans. Robert Hurley et al. (New York: The New York Press, 1998), 205, 221.
[21] Foucault, 222.

deemed inherent to authorship – impediments to the "free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition" of a text – can be established.[22] In short, by illuminating the readerly construction of authorship, Foucault's attempt to create an "author-function" was a method by which to scramble and make irrelevant the voice of the text, concluding as he opened on the Beckettian question "What difference does it make who is speaking?"[23]

For the author-subjects who direct the narratives of the scholarship by such critics John M. Picker and Ivan Kreilkamp, however, that difference was commercially and legally profound. Both Picker's *Victorian Soundscapes* (2003) and Kreilkamp's *The Victorian Storyteller* (2005) (and related works since) emerged out of a polyphony of debates, on the one hand, into technology and sound studies by critics such as Friedrich Kittler (*Gramophone, Film Typewriter*, 1999), Steven Connor (*Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism,* 2000), Allen S. Weiss (*Phantasmic Radio,* 1995), and Tim Armstrong (*Modernism, Technology, and the Body*, 1998). In very reductive terms, what often characterised such criticism was an attempt to synthesize and historicize the often horrified responses to the disembodied or "dispossessed" voice produced by early technologies of voice reproduction (responses which were frequently reified into mystical discourses of understanding), the visualization of voice and attempts to inscribe voice through laboratory instruments and the phonograph itself (putting the genie back in the bottle), and the physical augmentation of the body by technologies of reproduction. On the other hand, scholarship into copyright as indicated above was both maintaining momentum and widening the historical scope of investigation, with Picker's monograph, for example, appearing only a year after Joseph Loewenstein's *The Author's Due* (2002), which broke new ground in authorship studies by examining the increasingly problematized landscape of intellectual property law in the early twentieth century, a result of phonographic and pianola technologies.[24]

---

[22] Foucault, 221.
[23] Foucault, 222.
[24] "Such new apparatuses for sound reproduction", argues Loewenstein, "blurred already contested boundaries between musical text and musical performance, and between artisanal and mechanical production." See Joseph Loewenstein*, The Author's Due: Printing and the Prehistory of Copyright* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 5.

In Picker's *Victorian Soundscapes*, these critical conversations converge in the excavated narrative of Dickens's lecture tours. Despite, Picker argues, crafting the lecture tour into a fundamental component of professional authorship over a decade before the commercial release of the phonograph, the electrified presence he gave on the lecture *circuit* ensured that he could nevertheless "perfect and maintain a technology of oral presence".[25] For Dickens, binding the text to the authorial voice in public and cultural memory was a key pre-phonograph recording strategy through which to declare the sovereignty of the printed text, one that could be rehearsed to multiple and diverse audiences. As Amanda Adams would later argue in an even more determined rejection of Foucault's author-function, Dickens's conception of intellectual property rights "depended upon an assumption that the idea or 'authentic' version of a work was located *in* the author, not in a reproducible, published text", with each performance becoming a "performanc[e] of ownership".[26]

Yet these tours, Picker maintains, "transformed him into a reproducing speech machine", and with it the demand from his audiences to repeatedly invoke his most infamous, if not most recent, material.[27] Essentially, what underpins Picker's examination of Dickens's performed sovereignty over his texts is the premise that orality itself had become a key commercial interest. Far from the Romantic understanding of creativity as a "sublime experience", which for Woodmansee and Jaszi established the formal framework for literary copyright, Picker instead argues that this experience was reconfigured into "a quantifiable and marketable *object* or *thing*, a sonic commodity". Indeed, authors such as Dickens, for the first time, were attuned not only to the demands of the silent reader, but also to the demands of the "modern middle-class consumer".[28]

This assertion, of course, reinvigorates the debates around the social standing of authors in relation to their audiences, which for Dickens frequently swung between an empathetic alliance with those readers who comprised the literate poor to the socially aspirational drivers of a burgeoning middle class which underpinned the concerted effort to demarcate the property rights around his intellectual products. Ivan Kreilkamp, however, makes a clear distinction between the economies of writing and

---

[25] John M. Picker, *Victorian Soundscapes* (Oxford: OUP, 2003), 7.
[26] Amanda Adams, *Performing Authorship in the Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic Lecture Tour* (Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2014), 66-7.
[27] Picker, 7.
[28] Picker, 10.

storytelling. Indeed, in *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller* (2005), Kreilkamp returns the storyteller figure to the pre-print cultural economy of "folk culture". If for Eliot, in the mid-1930s, authorship needed to be reconfigured around the principles of productive leisure, he inherited the notion of literary "work" as underpinned by a social obligation to the community from the figure of Kreilkamp's storyteller.[29] However, for Kreilkamp, the Victorian storyteller not only recaptures his place as the "sage" at the centre of a community, but voice itself undergoes a transformation back into the tool of the labourer as a "form of manual craft".[30] Folk culture, Kreilkamp maintains, is a labour-based economy that becomes absorbed into the writing of the storyteller, a process by which writing "appropriates that labor for itself in the figure of an author whose speech is productive work".[31] What this process mitigates against is the absorption of the art of writing into a heavily commercialized print economy, and returning the voice of the author to a localized economy of folk culture permits "intellectual work" into an almost agrarian understanding of a "satisfying form of labor".[32]

Both uniting the author and storyteller, and returning the composite to the folklore economy, allows Kreilkamp to present a profile of authorship in which the voice, far from an adjunct to a conception authorship firmly rooted in the written word, was a fundamental component of the author compound. As with Picker, Kreilkamp invokes the construction of authorship manufactured by Dickens as a means by which to examine how such authors sought to control the dissemination and reproduction of his works through spoken performance, where performing authorship provided Dickens with "a means of controlling, protecting, and in effect copyrighting his writing as speech".[33] Yet as performance itself became infused into the written composition to the extent that, as Kreilkamp's profile demonstrates, to "read" the author was contingent upon the audience's ability to see and hear the author perform the text, only complicated rather than clarified the intellectual property landscape. Fused into the written text, the spoken voice inevitably emerged as a site of contest in

---

[29] See Eliot, "Notes on the Way" *Time and Tide* 16 (January 26, 1935): 118, 120-1; and Eliot, "The Search for Moral Sanction" *The Listener* 168 (March 30, 1932): 445-6, 480.
[30] Ivan Kreilkamp, *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 10-11.
[31] Kreilkamp, 11.
[32] Kreilkamp, 11.
[33] Kreilkamp, 90.

the politics of reproduction. As the performance of a creative work assumed an equivalent status to its textual counterpart for its authors, however imaginatively construed, it became increasingly apparent that the legal bulwarks in place for the protection of written works were conspicuously absent in the case of vocal performance of the same work. According to Kreilkamp, this prompted anxious examinations of how the spoken word could be controlled and authored, to the extent that Edison, in 1888, marketed the "perfected phonograph" as a technology that could protect authors' works "from being stolen by means of defective copyright laws".[34] For Dickens, so integrated had the oral performance of a work become in the economy around a printed text, that he sought to encode into the text the authenticity of authorial voice, which had the potential to reveal the forgery behind "unauthorized" readings of his works.[35]

For Yopie Prins in 2004, however, the tendency in the emerging field of sound studies to "recover" the voices of Victorian poets, "to read these poems as the utterance of a speaker, the representation of speech", has resulted in an overinflated "assumption that poems are transcriptions or prescriptions for voice".[36] Responding in particular to scholarship on the technology of sound reproduction which proliferated after the publication of Friedrich Kittler's *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter* (1999), Prins troubles the notion of the authoritative recorded voice, arguing instead that when we hear the voices of Tennyson and Browning, distorted and scratched, returned to us, we are in fact receiving a mechanical reproduction, an "inversion", of sound waves inscribed on a wax cylinder.[37] The auditory effects of poems, Prins maintains, "often seem to exceed the speaking voice", and we should look towards those "intervals" between what can be heard and what can be spoken as metrical patterns, "abstract notations in excess of what can be spoken, in a 'no-man's land' outside personification".[38] What Prins advocates is the practice of what she terms "'historical prosody'", which directs our attention away from the "utterances attributed to a single speaker" towards a broader understanding of how metres

---

[34] Kreilkamp, 87; Thomas A. Edison, "The Perfected Phonograph." *The North American Review* 146, no. 379 (June, 1888): 647.
[35] Kreilkamp, 96.
[36] Yopie Prins, "Voice Inverse." *Victorian Poetry* 42, no. 1 (Spring, 2004): 44-45.
[37] Prins, 49-50.
[38] Prins, 45, 52.

circulated in Victorian poetry, to uncover "a cultural history of forms".[39] What this entails, she explains, would be a redirection of our attention to the polyphonous debates on metre and prosody, debates that were informed by political, national, pedagogical, spiritual and scientific discourses on metrical influence. Acknowledging that forms of poetry, especially metrical forms, were historically contingent, Prins argues, recalls our focus to the diacritical "marks of culture" and away from cultural assumptions based on the technologically mediated inflections of the recorded voice.

Since the publication of Prins's article in 2004, scholars such Jason R. Rudy, Jason Hall, Michael Golston and Cornelia Pearsall have sought to situate a narrative, or narratives, of metre within a specific historical moment or aesthetic epoch, excavating rhythm back to prominence from beneath the rubble of the figurative and tropological criticism of the last ninety years.[40] It is perhaps Meredith Martin's monograph, *The Rise and Fall of Meter* (2012) that has to date been the most effective in not only disabling the "assumption that 'English meter' was and is a stable category", but which has also interrogated the multiplicity of historical narratives of metre conditioned by the political and religious discourses at work.[41] Metre, Martin begins, had the potential to be an "organizing principle" and a stabilizing factor in the way that poets reconciled "their relationship to the changing nation-state".[42] Yet it is Martin's powerful rejection of the notion often promulgated in introductory texts to Modernism that the movement "violated an established and stable tradition of English versification itself little concerned with experiment" that reveals the extent to which further excavation on Modernism's effacement of the history of prosody is still much needed.[43] Moreover, Modernism's, and especially Ezra Pound's, attempts to present a stable trajectory of metre from the "iambic stage" to the "post-iambic stage" (or free verse), have, until very recently, succeeded in silencing prosody's polyphonous history. The blame for metre's obfuscated history is

---

[39] Prins, 53.
[40] Jason R. Rudy. *Electric Meters: Victorian Physiological Poetics*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009; Jason Hall, ed. *Meter Matters: Verse Cultures of the Long Nineteenth Century*. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2011; Michael Golston. *Rhythm and Race in Modernist Poetry and Science*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008; Cornelia Pearsall. *Tennyson's Rapture: Transformation in the Victorian Dramatic Monologue*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
[41] Meredith Martin. *The Rise and Fall of Meter: Poetry and English National Culture, 1860-1930* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012), 1-2.
[42] Martin, 1-2.
[43] Martin, 3.

here laid firmly at Pound's door, and there is certainly something to be said for Pound's determination to market Modernism as the site of metrical freedom and innovation, despite, as Martin's monograph demonstrates, a keen understanding of the rhythmic innovations of his predecessors.

Pound may have first articulated, albeit belatedly, the desire to break the iamb, but, as this thesis will show, Eliot, too, was complicit in the effacement of the history of metre as politically and historically contingent, even as his own dramatic criticism on a new prosody was itself underpinned by the politics of national identity. If, as Martin asserts, prosody had the potential to impose a stabilizing influence on a poet's relationship to the state, how Eliot would fashion the history of English prosody at a time of political and economic tumult was contingent very much upon a rhetoric of European cohesion. English prosody, for Eliot in 1942, was an "amalgam like the amalgam of races, and indeed partly due to racial origins", an amalgam comprised of wholly European influences.[44] Indeed, building on the considerable volume of scholarship which has emerged since the publication of Lawrence Rainey's *Institutions of Modernism* (1998) and deploying the historical sensitivity of literary forms as products of institutional discourse advocated by Martin, the contention of this thesis, therefore, is that Eliot's understanding of multiple possibilities in the construction of national and local identities emerged in relation to cultural and national *institutions*, from federal income tax and copyright legislation and agendas, to cultural institutes and universities. It was through the voice of the public intellectual, however, that he could both confront and embed himself within these institutions, a voice which, as an intellectual *for* the "public", licensed his position at once within and at the peripheries of such establishments.

Modernism and Voice

Although, as the above overview suggests, this thesis is principally concerned with examining voice discursively through the cultural, political and social forces that condition, and in turn are conditioned by, authorial voice, it would be remiss of me to not to acknowledge the growth in philosophical enquires promoted as a result of Ong's *Orality and Literacy*. David Appelbaum's seminal *Voice* (1990), for example,

---

[44] Eliot, "The Music of Poetry," in *On Poetry and Poets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957), 29.

demonstrates its indebtedness both to Ong and Derrida in its assertion that voice is a site of secrecy and resistance, and defends ineffability – the "unspeechified" – from the historical charges of deception. Rather, for Appelbaum, all aspects of voice, from the cough to the grunt to the laugh, are "meaning-laden" truth statements, yet an encultured anxiety to control voice and "to defend against lapses in articulated sound" has created a unvoiced site of expression in our psychology, where speech itself becomes the "hiding place for one's own voice".[45]

Yet the beginning of the 1990s also saw a radical surge in scholarship not just on the voiced and unvoiced, but on the auditory imagination. Douglas Kahn and *Gregory Whitehead's Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde* (1992) was one of the first collections to fully investigate the history of aurality in relation to technologies of voice (re)production. For Kahn, aurality as a practice had been historically ignored by the "privileging of music as the art of sound in modern Western culture", a trend he identifies as having been upset by the rise of Modernism and the avant-garde. Indeed, Modernism, according to Kahn, illuminated the inherent discordance in musicality, the co-existence of "disjunctiveness and simultaneity that music could by its very nature perform". Like Appelbaum, Kahn takes umbrage at the encultured tendency to privilege the eye over the ear, and returns the narrative of sound to the Wittgensteinian *Grenzen*, the boundaries or borders of articulation where the ear strains to listen. It is here, argues Kahn, that technologies of sound, and particularly the phonograph, was identified as a technology capable of registering the "the technologically inaccessible regions of consciousness or the mysterious". Yet sound was still denied "autonomy" and was considered relationally to those borders of articulation that the phonograph could amplify.[46]

Such discussions are redirected back to the acoustic sounds of poetry in Charles Bernstein's edited collection *Close Listening: Poetry and the Performed Word* (1998). In this collection, Bernstein seeks to redress the absence of scholarship on the auditory and performative elements of a poem, an absence he puts down to the tendency in literary criticism to characterise "the sound structure of language " as "relatively arbitrary". This tendency, he argues, has produced crisis of sorts in

---

[45] David Appelbaum *Voice* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), ix-x.
[46] Douglas Kahn, "Introduction. Histories of Sound Once Removed, " in *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*, eds. Douglas Kahn and Gregory Whitehead (Cambridge, Mass., London: The MIT Press, 1992), 3-4, 15.

obtaining a totalized understanding of a poem. "Such elements as the visual appearance of the text or the sound of the work in performance may be extralexical but they are not extrasemantic", arguing that critical extraction of textual elements from a poem, "framed out as nonsemantic", culminate in a "a proliferation of possible frames of interpretation". What this problematizes, Bernstein theorizes, is the critic's ability to comprehend "these frames or strata" as a totalized conception of the poem, questioning, in fact, whether any reading of a poem can be totalizable.

However, perhaps the greatest impact on Modernist studies and its participation in the field of sound and technology studies has been Friedrich Kittler's Friedrich Kittler's *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter* (1999). Although incredibly dense and at times infuriatingly obfuscatory in both structure and argument, Kittler's work has largely been regarded as the grandfather of Modern technology studies. Kittler's thesis, when located, is, however, powerfully aphoristic: "Media determine our situation".[47] By attending to cultural and historical landscape out of which reproductions of sound, vision, and writing emerged, Kittler argues that such technologies not only immersed themselves discursively into the fabric of the quotidian, but altered the way that we articulate perception. In what is essentially a discussion on agency in terms of man's relation to the technology he produces, Kittler concludes that it is ultimately technologies that fashion us.

Since the publication of Kittler's landmark text, a number of scholars working in the field of Modernism have directed their attention to the way that sound reproducing technologies, in particular the radio, have both problematized the question of agency and authority and directly impacted on the way that we listen and read texts.[48] Michele Hilmes, in *Radio Voices: American Broadcasting, 1922-1952*,

---

[47] Friedrich A. Kittler, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter,* trans. and intro., Geoffrey Winthrop-Young and Michael Wutz (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999), xxxix.

[48] See, for example: Sara Danius, *The Senses of Modernism: Technology, Perception, and Aesthetics*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2002.; Jonathan Sterne. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2003.; David Suisman and Susan Strasser, eds. Sound in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.; Tim Armstrong. *Modernism, Technology, and The Body*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.; Emilie Morin, "Beckett's Speaking Machines: Sound, Radiophonics and Acousmatics." *Modernism/modernity* 21, no. 1 (January 2014): 1-24.; Edward Allen "'One Long, Unbroken, Constant Sound'": Wireless Thinking and Lyric Tinkering in Wallace Steven's *Harmonium.*" *Modernism/modernity* 21, no. 4 (November 2014): 919-936.

for example, points to the social conflicts instigated by radio technology, ranging from the rise of "mass culture" to as fundamental a "crisis in national identity".[49] Radio, it was feared, would cultivate an "homogenization of the American mind", through taste and consumerism to language itself. For Todd Avery, radio's potential to have an impact on the social and moral fabric of the nation was what underpinned the Director General of the BBC, John Reith's vision for the technology. Indeed, for Reith, the pedagogical and didactic potential of radio meant that the BBC's schedule should be oriented less around mass entertainment than attending to the elevation of "the nation's standard of conduct through a quasi-Arnoldian dissemination of culture to the listening masses". Yet at the same time, concedes Avery, radio was responsible for raising the profile andlaunching the careers of a number of Modernist authors, and one may naturally question how a movement so inclined towards challenging political and cultural institutions as much as engaging with them could find a platform on Reith's technological pedestal. Avery's answer is mediated through Eliot himself, who, as my own thesis will demonstrate, was turning his attention much more seriously to the cultivation of a public intellectual persona by the time he came to the microphone. Avery's monograph explores the development of Eliot's moral agenda consonant with Reith's Calvinistic approach to the corporation, and Avery concludes that it was a belief "in the necessity for intellectuals to employ radio as a means of influencing public opinion" that ultimately shaped his profile as a cultural sage.[50]

In their introduction to their edited collection *Broadcasting Modernism*, Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty concur with Avery in arguing that Modernist poets and authors "found their very sense of the artist's mission reshaped by the cultural project of radio". Indeed, this collection more forcefully interrogates the way that perceptions, as much as constructions of, authorship were dramatically revolutionized as a result of the cultivation of a radio presence.[51] As the editors observe, the move towards writing *for* the radio necessitated not only a reassessment of the "ways they organized and presented their work", but a revised understanding of the audiences to whom they were speaking.

---

[49] Michele Hilmes, *Radio Voices: American Broadcasting, 1922-1952* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), xiv.
[50] Avery, 8, 115-118.
[51] Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle, and Jane Lewty, "Introduction: Signing On," in *Broadcasting Modernism*, eds. Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle and Jane Lewty (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009), 2.

Given technology's potential to not only revise the function and categories of authorship and the attendant rise in vocal visibility for authors such as Woolf, Eliot and Orwell, it is unsurprising that alongside these investigations into Modernism's engagement with radio has been a surge in scholarship on Modernism and celebrity. Since the publication of Keven J. H. Dettmar and Stephen Watt's edited collection *Marketing Modernisms: Self-Promotion, Canonization, Rereading* in 1999, scholars such as Aaron Jaffe in *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* (2005) and Jonathan Goldman in *Modernism is the Literature of Celebrity* (2011) have attended to what might be called the necessary pragmatics of authorship.[52] That is, acknowledging the pecuniary concerns of Modernist authors permits a reassessment of the economic institutions and discourses that governed how such authors situated themselves in the market.

Although this thesis does not attend to Eliot as *celebrity*, it is indebted to the concomitant rise in these scholarly discourses on the technology of the voice and the development of an audible persona. That is not to say, however, that by attending to Eliot as a public intellectual I am refuting the enormity of his public influence, particularly in America, during the 1950s. Indeed, Eliot was, I think, aware of the conflationary boundaries that operated between the public intellectual and celebrity author figures, and scholars are quick to reference his 1956 lecture on "The Frontiers of Criticism" to illuminate his presence at the frontier between those two figures. It is easy, however, to overestimate the impact Eliot had on the cultural mindset during this period without first attending to how Eliot cultivated a position within the public intellectual economy, and we might exercise caution by adopting Eliot's own tongue-in-cheek reflection on the event. A cut out from *The Washington Post and Times Herald* that documents the events of that infamous evening resides in the Hayward Bequest at Cambridge: "13,720 in Sports Arena to Hear Poet Eliot Talk". 16,000 people were invited to attend the lecture from six states across the U.S: but "what happened to the 2280 other tickets?", Eliot writes.

---

[52] Kevin J. H. Dettmar and Stephen Watt, eds. *Marketing Modernisms: Self-Promotion, Canonization, Rereading* (4th ed.). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999; Aaron Jaffe. *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005; Jonathan Goldman. *Modernism is the Literature of Celebrity*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 2011.

What characterizes those studies proceeding from the work of critics such as Ong and Kittler is a commitment to a New Historicist approach to understanding the networks and discourses in which Modernist authors operated. However, it would be a misrepresentation of the scholarship on voice in Modernist studies to suggest that attention in this area has been confined to cultural history approaches at the expense of more "traditional" literary approaches. Indeed, search for the term "voice" in the back issues of *Modernism/modernity* and one can readily witness the compartmentalised approaches to voice that owes much to the branches of scholarship on voice inherited from the work of Ong, Appelbaum and Kittler, as well as from the framework for New Historicism instantiated by Greenblatt. From Maud Ellmann's article on "Joyce's Noises" to Margot Norris's "The Music of Joyce's Vernacular Voices" voice is attended to by focusing on authorial *representations* of voice and dialect inhabited within the text itself, close readings of which serve to illuminate "the opposition between voice and writing, sight and sound" for Ellmann, with Joyce's use of vernacular Irish discursively loaded with commentary on ethnicity, gender and class for Norris.[53]

My own methodology employed in this thesis is a mongrel one, but it is nevertheless indebted to the New Historicist and cultural history approaches to voice and sound technologies outlined above. In this vein, this thesis likewise draws on texts and events that operated within the discursive constellations of those of Eliot's works on which I focus. More specifically, however, my own historicist approach, which locates the vast majority of these discursive constellations in Eliot archives from across the world, owes much to Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969) and his definition of "archive" as a "density of discursive practices, systems that establish statements as events (with their own condition and domain of appearance) and things (with their possibility and field of use)". The archive is comprised, for Foucault, of "systems of statements (whether events or things)", and it resists being identified as a stable, immutable repository for statements:

> Far from being that which unifies everything that has been said in the great confused murmur of a discourse, far from being only that which ensures that we exist in the midst of preserved discourse, it is that which differentiates

[53] See Maud Ellmann, "Joyce's Noises." *Modernism/modernity* 16, no. 2. (April 2009): 383-390; Margot Norris, "The Music of Joyce's Vernacular Voices." *Modernism/modernity* 16, no. 2 (April 2009): 377-382.

> discourses in their multiple existence and specifies them in their own duration.[54]

Indeed, throughout this thesis I attend to manuscripts of lectures and broadcasts, as well as correspondence, which exist within multiple discursive systems. Approaching this archival material using Foucault's definition above entails acknowledging the multiplicity of narratives and histories attendant on any one archival document at a time. This becomes particularly important when dealing with written manuscripts of oral lectures and broadcasts, where the written and even published format of a manuscript intended for oral delivery operates at times within a very different discursive field than its performed but unpublished counterpart.

The inherent nature of the archival artifact as performing within multiple discursive systems means that it rarely conforms to the artificial junctures in a writer's development or biography. Indeed, one of the disabilities of Eliot studies is the volume of work that he produced, and critical methods of managing and processing this output have contributed to the deconstruction of both Eliot's literary works and his biography into quite distinct periods, whether as binary as the pre- versus post-Conversion phase, to transitions between the "early poetry", *The Waste Land*, "religious drama" period or his "later poetry". Working so comprehensively with archival material necessarily entails the relinquishing of these assumptions, and, though ambitious, this freedom to demolish these boundaries allows for a longitudinal approach to understanding how Eliot cultivated his voice as a key component of modern authorship, with its responsibility to respond to social and political events, over a sustained period of time.

Chapter Outline

Although one of the most prolific public speakers of his time, this thesis investigates the multiple dimensions, or multi-faceted, conception of voice upon which Eliot's public intellectual role was architected. Indeed, as Eliot's first radio broadcasts catapulted him for the first time into the auditory awareness of the public, paving the way for over thirty years of unrelenting requests for guest lectures, readings, radio lectures, and charity speeches, this thesis looks to examine the

---

[54] Michel Foucault. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 2002),145-146.

cultural, historical, political and legal conditions and discourses which at times impinged on as much as shaped the discursive dimension of authorship that he styled throughout his career.

My approach to voice owes more to the scholarship of Ivan Kreilkamp, whose critical approach to authorship sees a coalescence, though uneasy at times, between print and vocal culture, and whose figure of the storyteller is rehabilitated into the vocation of labourer, "whose very voice is a form of manual craft".[55] Eliot, as I will show in Chapter One, likewise conceptualises authorship in similar terms, and it is within a pragmatic framework of economic and political influence and impetus that I approach voice in this thesis. In its crudest terms, this thesis examines the historical development of Eliot's voice not only into one of the most lucrative components of authorship – one which allowed him to command fees as high as $3000 in the early to mid- 1950s – but which gave him access to and authority to intervene in such critical debates taking place within the U.S. on linguistic hegemony and preservation to the complex geopolitical conversations occurring within Europe on political and cultural unity.

Yet, as Eliot's speaking engagements – whether through lectures, broadcasts, or recordings – became an increasingly dominant component of his profession, the conflicting pressures to uphold the principles of free movement of knowledge through boundary-defying technologies such as the radio whilst simultaneously protecting the intellectual material contained within those lectures and broadcasts became more pressing. How Eliot negotiated this conflict in an era of copyright legislation still in embryonic form in terms of radio and recording technologies is the subject of Chapter Four. Although scholars have attended to the increasing commercialisation of the author's voice that took place in the nineteenth century, in order to address how Eliot adapted the authorial voice to meet the demands of twentieth-century pressures on authorial autonomy and responsibility, this thesis sets out to answer the following questions: what were the ideological conditions that underpinned Eliot's long-term commitment to the principle of free intellectual exchange between nations? To what extent did this principle inform Eliot's commitment to the cultural engagement lectures he undertook on behalf of the British Council, and how could he reconcile "organised culture" with the organic understanding of cultural generation

[55] Kreilkamp, 10.

communicated in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*? Moreover, what stimulated Eliot's conviction, articulated in the years immediately following the WWII, that "men of letters" as "common trustees" were endowed with the responsibility for the "preservation" and "heritage" of Europe's "common culture"? What were the particular legal and political conditions behind the practical barriers to both free intellectual exchange and the expanding notion of authorship and authorial social responsibility to which Eliot subscribed? Chapter One begins not with the radio lectures, but with an analysis of early twentieth-century political discussions on intellectual freedom and exchange which, I argue, had a vital formative influence on a speaking career that took off following his first broadcast lectures in 1929. This chapter lays the groundwork for pursuing this question by examining the historical and ideological conditions out of which Eliot cultured the nucleus for his public intellectual persona. Yet, just as this chapter explores how Eliot's understanding of the principles of free intellectual exchange and the absence of economic boundaries were born out of his encounter with Liberal ideology during World War I, this discussion reveals, however, the extent to which Eliot struggled to reconcile the politics of Wilsonian Liberalism in the U.S. with the intellectual principles of Liberal ideology. U.S. Liberal politics, which had found its footing by the beginning of the War, had a direct impact on the Eliot family, contributing to the financial strain Eliot would find himself under in the War years through the reduction of dividends from the family business and the impact of having to pay federal income tax. Income tax would, Eliot found, obfuscate the conditions for American identity for expatriates, conditions which prompted Eliot to file for British naturalization. Nevertheless, it was upon the principles of free *intellectual* trade that the *Criterion* was established, contractual and conceptual negotiations taking place as early as August 1921 and at the moment that Eliot began to file for naturalization.[56] As the British economy struggled to restore itself, the intellectual economy likewise found itself navigating the aftereffects of the Treaty of Versailles, which had imposed heavy tariffs and embargos on the intellectual trade routes between nations through heavy export and import duties. Although Europe would see a slight reprieve in such impediments in

[56] Lady Rothermere was writing to Eliot on August 21, 1921 "to confirm the arrangement made between us for your appointment as the sole responsible Editor of the Quarterly Magazine to be called the London Quarterly to some similar title approved by us jointly", a Quarterly later to be named *The Criterion*. See *Letters I*, 577-8.

the mid-1920s, Europe's intellectual walls began to be slowly erected by the early 1930s, and the *Criterion* found itself victim once again to the closure of trade routes.

What persisted, however, was Eliot's conviction in intellectual free trade between nations as an essential component to the cultural health of a nation. If embargos could impede the exchange of written texts (a method of attrition Eliot rallied against during World War II with Books Across the Sea), this chapter addresses the extent to which the voice had the potential to transgress these border controls, a concept that, I argue, underpinned both the content of and participation in the British Council tours of the 1940s. Yet to embark on ambassadorial cultural tours for a government-funded British institution required a finely calibrated sense of positioning in relation to British cultural identity. Using previously unseen archival material that documents the six-year process of Eliot's path to citizenship, this chapter draws on close readings of his poems written during this period to demonstrate that nationality in post-War Europe was an unstable and protean concept. It is the contention of this chapter that the bureaucratic process of obtaining naturalization not only had far-reaching implications for the anthropological positioning of the cultural observer in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, but also calibrated the position from which Eliot could reflect on British culture to a European audience, therefore laying the intellectual foundations for the extensive networks of lectures he would give during the wartime period.

Chapter Two pursues this line of enquiry by exploring how Eliot undertook a revisionist approach to the concept of culture whilst occupying a privileged position at the periphery. By deconstructing the fallacy of naturalization as a mark of alterity that deposits its subjects at the edges of a culture, and proceeding from Edward Said's examination of the privileged position of "exilic displacement" for the public intellectual, this chapter seeks to explore how the ideological impetus behind the British Council lectures served as a primer for Eliot's understanding of cultural exchange between nations and the mechanisms by which the intellectual elite could facilitate that exchange. Despite an ambivalence about participating in what he considered to be politically motivated organized culture as antithetical to the organicism of cultural development, Eliot's sensitivity to the need to maintain the intellectual free trade channels was reinvigorated, five years after the closing of the *Criterion*, in his "cultural mission" to Sweden in 1942. Nevertheless, what characterized this and subsequent talks on behalf of the British Council was the

underlying principle, articulated as early as 1943 in Eliot's lecture on "The Nature of Cultural Relations" and reaffirmed in *Notes Towards a Definition of Culture*, that it was the voice of the individual ambassador of an organisation, and not the organisation itself, which should arbitrate in the cultural relations between nations. It was the trust conferred on speakers such as Eliot by the British Council to not only respond to the need to encourage cultural exchange during wartime but to craft the terms of that response, that guaranteed the autonomy and individuality of the voice of the speaker. Voice as legitimising

With this in mind, part two of this chapter addresses the content of Eliot's lectures delivered primarily in France in 1945, Italy in 1947, and Germany in 1949, the context and circumstances of which have yet to be fully investigated. Indeed, part two aims to qualify the decision made by Eliot during these tours to focus primarily on dramatic criticism. Unwilling to accept that the tours were opportunistic occasions on which Eliot could promote plays, this chapter looks towards the politics of dramatic performance operating within these countries during the War years. Moreover, by drawing on the criticism of Meredith Martin, I argue that Eliot's devising of a localized system of dramatic prosody that derives its dialect from the discourse of the everyday was in fact historically contingent. Responding to the nationalist rhetoric particularly endemic in France, Italy and Germany in the aftermath of the War, Eliot's system of dramatic prosody, introduced through some of his best known lectures on the subject and delivered abroad, was a mechanism by which to re-channel inflamed feelings of political discontent through a poetic idiom of the local.

Yet what were the conditions in which the seed for Eliot's theory that poetic language "must not stray too far from the ordinary everyday language which we use and hear" could germinate?[57] This is the question that underpins Chapter Three, as the narrative returns to the period immediately preceding Eliot's naturalization to examine his participation in a dialect project undertaken at the University of Columbia in 1933. Taking its lead from the transnational cultural histories of voice modeled in such studies as Michael North's *The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature* (1994) and Joshua Miller's *Accented America: The Cultural Politics of Multilingual Modernism* (2011), this chapter

[57] Eliot, "The Music of Poetry", 20.

examines a particular moment in America's linguistic history that bore witness to the preservation of distinctly American (largely North-Eastern) dialects at the expense of those racially diverse dialects seized upon by the American avant-garde. North's account, in particular, of the "linguistic tug-of-war between England the United States" that was seen by American poets as a threat to the vernacular idiom which was beginning to emblematize much of the American modernist poetry emerging at the time, was also revealing deep fissures in the intellectual establishment.[58] Where a number of Anglophile academics loudly opposed immigration whilst "preaching linguistic solidarity with England", North identifies the counterattack in such intellectuals as H. L. Mencken, whose *The American Language* (1919) was a key document in the war of "linguistic independence".[59] For North, however, this war between the Old and the New worlds of the English language that was taking place on America's home front was being fought, consciously or not, on "terms that were simultaneously linguistic and racial".[60] In its attempt to undermine the largely academic defence of "English and New Englandish" poetic and linguistic traditions, the Americanist avant-garde embraced the "racial and linguistic diversity" that allowed it to situate itself outside of the pro-England canon as a "racial outsider".[61] Yet burdened by the "persistent inability to understand how race fit into its conception of modern America", North argues that its positioning particularly of African American dialect as linguistic other exaggerated the peripheral position of such dialects, pushing the possible contact between the American avant-garde and that "powerful and yet curiously undefinable dialect" ever further away.

Published almost twenty years later, Millers account of the same period builds quite substantially on North's work by offering a more nuanced and broad-ranging narrative of America's linguistic pluralism that was the result of "unparalled migration" in the early twentieth century. Miller explores the "seeming paradoxes" of the era which saw the emergence of the "first language legislation in United States history" coincide with "the vanguardist movements of modernist literature", where "nativist 'English-only' nationalism drew on long-standing linguistic anxieties" and yet shared "the same social forces that also infused the experimental idioms of

---

[58] Michael North. *The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press), 130.
[59] North, 130-131.
[60] North, 131.
[61] North, 135.

modernist literature with radical energies".[62] With "linguistic alterity…understood as a surrogate for race and class differences", this difference emerged as a yardstick against which patriotism and citizenship were measured:

> Despite the fact that there was no federal legislation to establish English as a national language during these years, the concept of a national speech standard was advocated by politicians and industrialists as a test of patriotism, and non-English/nonstandard speech forms were treated as a brand of disloyalty and even evidence of treason[63]

It was directly into the midst of these debates that Eliot, just four years after renouncing his American citizenship in favour of a formal British national identity, entered during his tenure at Harvard University and as he undertook recordings at Columbia University as part of an American dialect project. At this time, Columbia was nestled between different factions in this linguistic war: the intellectual establishment advocating linguistic unity with England and those scholars, such as William Cabell Greet, committed to the preservation of distinctly American dialects found themselves cohabiting at Columbia. Meanwhile, less than a few miles away from the campus door, the Harlem Renaissance was flourishing, testing that fragile paradigm that saw pure American English as a distinctly national test of American identity. And towards Manhattan and Brooklyn, the largely white avant-garde that fed on the radicalism of racial otherness embodied in the African American rhythms of dialect poetry. The epicenter of these debates on linguistic and national unity was New York: a localized and contained environment for what was essentially a language in existential crisis.

It is unsurprising that given the volatility of American English as a stable category in national identity and identity formation that scholars such as Greet should respond with a preservationist instinct. Indeed, using archival materials which document the trajectory of a project designed to map the oral topography of the U.S., and which demonstrate the initiative to preserve the voices of specifically American poets that emerged out of such a project, this chapter illuminates the extent to which Eliot was not only alert to discourses of dialect preservation ongoing in the U.S. at this time, but was integrated into those discourses through the phonographic archiving

---

[62] Joshua L. Miller. *Accented America: The Cultural Politics of Multilingual Modernism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 12.
[63] Miller, 30; 15.

of his voice. Eliot's voice would join a catalogue of other Modernist voices intended to map, archive and preserve the voice of the poet, and it is out of this experience that Eliot would define, in 1942, the function of the poet to both "preserve" and "extend" the spoken language.[64] Moreover, this chapter deals with the cultural and institutional evolution of the process of recording, investigating how Columbia itself drew on the anthropological practices of recording the voices of native Indians (particularly in the work of Franz Boas) to conceptualise an aesthetic project consonant with the discursive push towards a nationally defined "American" language.

The concluding chapter to this thesis intervenes in the discussions on Modernism and copyright, initiated by Paul Saint-Amour in *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (2003) and his edited collection *Modernism and Copyright* (2011), to suggest that Eliot's absence from critical discussions of Modernist authors' sensitivity to the institutions of copyright requires revision. Indeed, although never as vociferous on the subject as Pound, Eliot was carefully negotiating his position in relation to these institutions during his time as editor of *The Egoist*. This calculated position, I argue, was further calibrated through the intellectual debates on copyright that were mediated through the *Criterion*, when Eliot's own position as publisher and editor situated him firmly at the centre of legal frameworks for copyright. Certainly the *Criterion* would prove an important vehicle for intellectual and historically revisionist accounts of copyright inherent to New Bibliography Studies, and this chapter explores how such debates, observed and edited by Eliot, informed the metadiscursive commentaries on copyright articulated in his first radio broadcasts for the BBC in 1929.

Indeed, the final section of this chapter argues that Eliot's ascension to the microphone in 1929 was far from opportunistic. Building on the groundwork laid in Chapters One and Two, which chart the development of Eliot's public intellectual persona in Britain and Europe, this section argues that these lectures suggest a self-conscious reflection on the construction of authorship and copyright through a medium that neither respected nor controlled the oral intellectual property of the author. By returning his attention to the writers and playwrights of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, during which time embryonic institutions of copyright were being erected, Eliot explores the ramifying effects of this media on intellectual

[64] Eliot, "The Music of Poetry", 20.

property rights and the established, legally codified construction of authorship in the early twentieth century.

Chapter One: The Pioneer Poet

> It may appear to be contradictory to say that this radical pioneer of form, the initiator of a whole revolution in style within present-day poetry, is at the same time a coldly reasoning, logically subtle theorist, who never wearies of defending historical perspectives and the necessity of fixed norms for our existence. […]
>
> Mr. Eliot - According to the diploma, the award is made chiefly in appreciation of your remarkable achievements as a pioneer within modern poetry.
>
> Anders Österling, "Award Ceremony Speech" on awarding T. S. Eliot the 1948 Nobel Prize.

In November 1928, Eliot replied to a letter from Lincoln Kirstein, the editor of the American arts journal *Hound and Horn*, which had solicited an article by Eliot on Henry James and the effect of expatriation upon his work. Eliot declined, explaining that having written about him ten years earlier, he was not ready to do so again: "as for the subject of expatriation, I think I may have something to say about that in twenty-five years time: I do not want to speak of it until I can do so from the retrospective tranquillity of old age."[65] Whether Eliot had this letter in mind when, twenty-five years later in 1953, he returned to St. Louis to deliver an address at Washington University to mark its centenary, is unclear: but in this lecture Eliot does reflect on the linguistic position of the expatriate, an ability afforded by his occupying a privileged position within a cultural annex. Ruminating on the circulation of the purist attitudes towards an American language inspired by H. L. Mencken, which sought to instigate a "linguistic Declaration of Independence" from British English, Eliot questions both the validity and the effectiveness of implementing linguistic border controls by drawing on an ornithological analogy:

> In October last occurred an event which, while not as spectacular as the descent of Col. Lindbergh at Le Bourget in "The Spirit of St. Louis", is

[65] TSE to Lincoln Kirstein, November 16, 1928, in *Letters*, ed. Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden, vol. 4, 1928-1929 (London: Faber and Faber, 2013), 318. Hereafter *Letters IV*.

> equally remarkable in its kind. For the first time, apparently, an American robin, well named *Turdus migratorius*, crossed the Atlantic under its own power, "favoured" according to the report, by "a period of strong westerly weather". This enterprising bird was also intelligent, for it chose to alight on Lundy Island, off the coast of Devon, which happens to be a bird sanctuary. Of course even birds, nowadays, are not allowed to travel without undergoing official inquisition, so our robin was trapped, photographed, and released; and, I hope, provided with a ration book. It is interesting to speculate on the future of this pilgrim. Either he (or she, for the sex is not stated) will be followed by another of the opposite sex, in which event we may expect that England will soon be populated by American robins; or else our lone pioneer must make the best of it, and breed with the English thrush, who is not *migratorius* but *musicus*. In the latter event, the English must look out for a new species of thrush, with a faint red spot on the male breast in springtime; a species which, being a blend of *migratorius* and *musicus*, should become known as the troubadour-bird, or organ-grinder.[66]

Birds would become a recurring metaphor or analogy for Eliot in discussions relating to linguistic and intellectual migration, particularly trans-Atlantic migration.[67] Indeed, I open with this quotation because it articulates the life-long concerns Eliot had with questions of intellectual, linguistic and cultural free movement and exchange, concerns which he expressed from a privileged "outside-within" position. Here, Lundy Island is a useful intra-analogy, for it occupies an external and annexed position in relation to Britain, both a useful observation point and a space which allows for possibilities of cultural cross-fertilisation or sovereignty, and yet still one regulated by those mechanisms which at once confer citizenship – illustrated here by the "ration book" – but which also treat the outsider with some circumspection. Equally pertinent is that whilst the "pilgrim" is documented and tracked, he is nevertheless "released", free from constrictions in movement, so allowing for propagation through a naturally-occurring cultural imperialism, or, more likely, through assimilation with the host breed or culture. Yet cultural cross-fertilisation, Eliot appears at pains to stress, is by no means a guarantor of qualitative success.

---

[66] Eliot, "American Literature and the American Language." *The Sewanee Review* 4, no.1 (Winter 1966): 9, accessed June 24, 2013, http://www.jstor.org/stable/27541381.
[67] The poetic manifestations of these discussions I address in Chapter 3.

At the heart of this chapter, however, is the figure of the public intellectual as pioneer, the existence of whom is predicated on the absence, or rather unsettling, of intellectual and economic boundaries. Eliot's cultivation of the voice of the public intellectual was underpinned by the Liberal principle of free trade and the absence of tariffs, one that he sustained even as he would publicly denounce Liberal intellectualism most famously in Virginia in 1933. The first half of this chapter will attend to Eliot's lifelong concern that language, culture and intellectualism needed to operate free of the protectionist mechanisms of imports and exports, free, in short, of the economic and moral tariffs in place for most of Eliot's professional life which imposed penalties through censorship and the strictures of copyright law. These tariffs became impediments in the cultural transmission of the text, impediments which could nevertheless be circumnavigated through the voice. By drawing on previously unseen archival material, the discussion focuses on Eliot's cultivation of a public intellectual voice.

Although scholars such as Gail McDonald and Stefan Collini have considered in depth Eliot's public intellectual persona in relation to his written criticism, I want to suggest in this chapter that Eliot's engagement in what *The Sunday Times* called a "cultural mission" through his work for the British Council between 1939 and 1949 was an attempt to dismantle the cultural frontiers between European countries during and immediately after the Second World War.[68] Where Collini, however, has argued that Eliot felt his foreignness to be a "disability that [he] worked assiduously to overcome", this underestimates the degree to which Eliot actually exploited his position as a "naturalized" citizen.[69] This took the form of a carefully controlled exilic identity inherited from Henry James: Eliot's citizenship was never a central identity, but always to the side, investing him, to borrow Said's account of the exiled public intellectual, with the imaginative potential to "investigate in spite of barriers, and always to move away from the centralizing authorities towards the margins, where you see things that are usually lost on minds that have never traveled beyond the conventional and the comfortable."[70]

---

[68] "Poet's Mission" *The Sunday Times*, April 26, 1942.
[69] Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 325.
[70] Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual: the Reith Lectures* (New York: First Vintage Books, 1996), 62-3.

Yet there is a danger, warns Said, of "hold[ing] up the individual intellectual as a perfect ideal, a sort of shining knight who is so pure and noble as to deflect any suspicion of material interest."[71] Indeed, as Jason Harding has shown in his account of Eliot's influence over the shaping of Britain's intellectual landscape as editor of *The Criterion*, Eliot was an editor heavily invested and immersed in the "minutiae relating to the commodification of writing in the market-place," one who "frequently worried over the commercial imperatives of finance and circulation". Such a profile of Eliot, as Harding refreshingly reveals, is often met by a "lofty distaste" by modern scholars, and I take my lead from Harding to argue that if Eliot's public intellectual role reveals anything at all, it is that he possessed first and foremost the "cold reasoning" of the shrewd pragmatist.[72] Even in the years following his Nobel Prize win and the commercial success of *The Cocktail Party*, Eliot was inclined to use the fees earned from his public lectures to fund his trips to the States, writing to Marguerite Cohn in 1957 in advance of his tour that year that

> [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[73]

However, this is not to undermine the considerable number of gratis appearances and speeches Eliot made for charitable purposes. Rather, this letter clarifies the distinction Eliot made between the profession of the public intellectual, for whom the stage was the lecture hall of universities of immense wealth, the philanthropist speech maker of charity fund raisers, and the open-access position of broadcaster, who would often redirect his fees for radio productions to the Church or other charities. Eliot was, according to his former secretary Jane Mozley, a reluctant public figure, a compromising position for a poet whose celebrity and notoriety drew the boundaries of the auditory range of his criticism.[74] Educated in a country that inaugurated a tradition of lecture circuits and authorial celebrity, where public performance became a necessary adjunct to writing in a publishing climate hostile to remunerating its authors, Eliot would also be exposed to the Liberal paradigm of the public intellectual in England. Authorial license to pronounce on the health of a

---

[71] Said, 69.
[72] Jason Harding, *The* Criterion: *Cultural Politics and Periodical Networks in Inter-War Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 2.
[73] TSE to Marguerite Cohn, letter, April 23, 1957, box 2, House of Books Collection, Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, New York.
[74] Jane Mozley, 2013. Interview by author. Bath, December 8.

nation's culture originated, then, in a popular idiom of literary performance which had been naturalized into a British intellectual vernacular, and which was also drawing on a Liberal notion of the public "moralist". By the mid 1930s, the public intellectual for Eliot had not only become a profession, but had forced the re-evaluation of the largely Marxian understanding of the term "work", where intellectual graft was legitimised through an understanding of the mental effort and processes.[75]

This conception of intellectual "work", however, could only emerge out a liberal understanding of free trade which conditioned literary as much as industrial trans-Atlantic commerce in the early twentieth century. In the next section, the focus will turn to excavating the foundations of Eliot's formula for the public intellectual from beneath the rubble of Liberal intellectualism.

1.1 Liberalism and Intellectual Free Trade

Although British Liberalism, as an active political movement, had exhaled its last breath in the early 1920s, it was a term denoting a particular cultural position very much still alive for Eliot as he gave the Page-Barbour Lectures in Virginia in 1933. Even here, however, the ambiguous and even paradoxical position he would take in relation to liberalism is characterised by its capitalisation as he invokes "a society like ours, worm-eaten with Liberalism."[76] Liberalism is seen as a deep-rooted, endemic and potentially trans-Atlantic problem, a contagious strain of political and cultural intellectualism that is incubated particularly in the hot-houses of the Oxbridge university system. Writing in the *Harvard Advocate* in the same year in which *After Strange Gods* was published, Eliot recycles the metaphor in a discussion of mass education, invoking a rather Calvinist precept that education needs to be ordered around a "definite social philosophy and some notion of the true vocation of man". Largely secular, decentralised, and landed, Oxford and Cambridge derive a pedagogical authority and autonomy from being immune to the demands of the "industrial aristocracy": nevertheless, "I should not care to see American universities imitating Oxford and Cambridge, even to the worm-holes in the system."

Decimated and hollowed-out, his was still a society both scaffolded and infested by an ideological synthetic termite that threatened to breed "a spirit of excessive tolerance" he thought should be "deprecated", and that served to insidiously

---

[75] Eliot, "Notes on the Way." *Time and Tide* 16 (January 26, 1935): 118, 120-1.
[76] Eliot, *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy* (London: Faber and Faber, 1934), 13.

undermine a "law of nature" that deemed that "local patriotism, when it represents a distinct tradition and culture, takes precedence over a more abstract national patriotism."[77] If excessive state intervention threatened the primacy of local "loyalty" in favour of a centralised government ("There is no life that is not in community", he writes in *The Rock*), and so upsetting the "balance between urban and rural, industrial and agricultural development", never was this more felt by Eliot than in the war years, reporting to Conrad Aiken in January 1916, "Living is going up. Eggs are three pence. Income tax heavy."[78] Condensed into headlines, Eliot relays the impact on everyday life of state intervention. The effects of the "Increase in Rent and Mortgage Interest (War Restrictions) Act" of 1915, an attempt to stabilise and control rent increases, were mitigated by an increase in income tax to forty per cent at the beginning of 1916 (the burden, in Eliot's report, communicated through the collapse of the verb and the terminal position of the adjective), and an average increase in food prices of thirty-five per cent reported in September 1915.[79] Indeed, income tax, or any form of individual taxation, would be an irreconcilable ideological (as well as practical) burden for Eliot throughout his lifetime, but it also instances the rather complex understanding of liberalism he had during these war years.

Eliot's hostility towards liberalism has not gone unnoticed by critics in recent years (or at the time), with Michael North linking his "distress" over the "liberal divorce of individual and race" to the "anomalous position" he occupied as both citizen and intellectual (74). Meanwhile, Vincent Sherry in *The Great War and the Language of Modernism* (2003) suggests that Eliot's indictment of Liberalism culminates in a collapse of that tradition from the inside, an act of linguistic sabotage – "breaking the code".[80] Sherry's account demonstrates Eliot's investment in the "imaginative possibilities of the pseudo-logic of English Liberalism", and in doing so reveals that an understanding of Eliot's interaction with Liberalism and liberal ideology requires very careful calibration.[81] If this calibration is frustratingly difficult to achieve it is only because Eliot's early engagement with Liberalism expresses a

---

[77] *After Strange Gods*, 20.
[78] TSE to Conrad Aiken, January 10, 1916 in *Letters,* ed. Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden, vol. 1, 1898-1922 revised edition (London: Faber and Faber, 2009), 138. Hereafter *Letters I*.
[79] "35 Per Cent. Increase in Food Prices" *The Times* September 16, 1915.
[80] Vincent Sherry, *The Great War and the Language of Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 165.
[81] Sherry, 165.

tension not only in the political versus the ideological term, but between a quite distinct American and British appropriation of that term.[82]

However, as his letters from this period show, Liberalism becomes a site of reaction for Eliot, where his postured condemnation, for example, of Woodrow Wilson at the beginning of the War – a measure of both family allegiance and a dependence upon a threatened source of income – is tempered by the admiration he has for Wilson's blueprint for peace in Europe by the War's end. Indeed, Sherry has worked to calibrate Eliot's position in relation to a British liberal tradition and politics by suggesting that the performative rhetoric of Liberalism during the war prompted an aesthetics that worked within this rhetoric only to implode it. The following discussion builds on Sherry's excavation by suggesting that the material conditions for this aesthetic implosion of British Liberalism were, in fact, dependent on a conceptual cornerstone of Wilsonian Liberalism: the disintegration of tariffs.

According to the third volume of Eliot's letters, edited by John Haffenden, the earliest intimation that Eliot was actively pursuing British citizenship was in November 1926.[83] Although acknowledged in another footnote to a letter from Geoffrey Faber to The Warden of All Souls College in April 1926 that Charles Haigh-Wood, Eliot's father-in-law, had acted as a sponsor to Eliot's application, the

---

[82] For L. T. Hobhouse, writingin 1919, Liberalism was underpinned by the principle of "civil liberty", informed by a Lockean understanding of the right to be protected by the law, which reacted against the *ancien regime* of the French revolution, and, more contemporaneously, Russian totalitarianism. The tradition of civil liberty had long been embodied in the Petition of Right and Habeas Corpus, but "the first condition of free government is government not by the arbitrary determination of the ruler, but by fixed rules of law, to which the ruler himself is subject". Under fixed rule of law, citizens could be guaranteed certain liberties, including: "fiscal liberty"; "personal liberty", including "liberty of thought" and "liberty to exchange thought" with its attenuated rights of free speech and free press; "social liberty", which amounted to the "freedom to choose and follow an occupation" made contingent by a "national system of free education" and support for trade unions; "economic liberty", where tariffs were considered "an obstruction to free enterprise" and a "source of inequality as between trade and trade"; "local, racial and national liberty", which licensed nations to defend themselves against foreign rule. Crucially, however, Hobhouse perceived Liberalism to be an essential defence for the author, in that it challenged "convention, insincerity, and patronage" and defended the right for "free self-expression". "Liberalism", Hobhouse concludes, "is an all-penetrating element of the life-structure of the modern world". See *Liberalism* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1919), 21-47.

[83] Eliot, *The Letters of T. S. Eliot,* ed. Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden, vol. 3,1926-1927 (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), 303n. Hereafter *Letters III*.

complete narrative of Eliot's naturalization remains sketchy.[84] In fact, an earlier inkling of Eliot's desire to acquire British citizenship occurs in the 2009 revised edition of the first volume of his letters, which gives a strong indication of the more pragmatic concerns which underpinned his application. Indeed, unromantic as this account might now appear, Eliot's initial motivations for obtaining British citizenship did not simply originate from a sense of intellectual or cultural displacement and alienation. Rather, in what would become a recurring concern for Eliot, the impetus came from the sharply dressed suits of the quotidian, the taxman: "I have been further exasperated by insults from the American Consulate", he informs Richard Aldington in a letter postmarked October 15, 1921, "who furthermore wish to collect Income Tax from me. I must get my naturalisation papers in order and wish I knew some prominent person in the Home Office to press it forward."[85]

Eliot's preoccupation with, and his hostility towards, income tax resides was at the forefront of the process of his naturalisation, but it also initiates the complex and deeply ambivalent negotiations with Liberalism he had well into the 1930s. As an expatriate dependent to a meaningful degree on the financial security of the family business in St. Louis, the introduction of income tax in the U.S. through Wilson's 1913 Tariff Act dealt a double blow to Eliot's finances during the war. A "'disciple' of Gladstone" (whose picture Wilson reputedly hung on his wall whilst President of Princeton), Wilson's Tariff Act emerged out of a political agenda informed by nineteenth-century British liberalism. The repeal of the Corn Laws in England in 1846 under Peel not only attracted the support of Gladstone, but provided an economic underpinning for the Liberal Party, and free trade remained a principle tenet of Liberalism even after its suspension during the War. Likewise, Wilson's Act was the first step towards free trade in the U.S., and in an Address to Congress in April 1913 Wilson envisioned "free business" as being codified within a "law of nature" rather than "by the law of legislation and artificial arrangement."[86] Eager to break the artificial, protectionist monopolies which dominated the American market, Wilson's Act chiefly targeted the raw materials and manufacturing industry, including the

---

[84] *Letters III*, 137n.
[85] *Letters I*, 592-3.
[86] Woodrow Wilson, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress on Tariff Reform," April 8, 1913, *The American Presidency Project*, ed. Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, accessed June 18, 2014, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65368.

construction business in which Eliot's family were heavily invested. Indeed, as the letters between Eliot and his family attest, the Act had an immediate effect on the Hydraulic-Press Brick Company, with Eliot writing to his brother in November 1916 concerned that his father "writes very despondently about finances".[87] So detrimental was this legislation to the family business that by 1919 the family's hostility towards Wilson and his economic policy had become galvanized by the necessity to liquidate the company and the estate: "I want him," writes Henry Eliot, "to live long enough for the people to discover him in his true character."[88]

If Henry Eliot in 1919 was waiting for Wilson's "true character" to reveal itself, it was *in character* that Eliot, in 1914, would voice the performed resistance to the Tariff Act. Writing to Eleanor Hinkley in July 1914 as he crossed the Atlantic, Wilson's liberal policy, which was designed to nullify social "privilege" and to "open up once more the free channels of prosperity", is reconstituted here in a parody of dialect that anticipates his "Old Possum"-"Brer Rabbit" correspondence with Pound: "Yes this genlmn knows I'm speakin gospel truth (pointing at me) he's connected with the buildin trades hisself, he knows how business is now, its Wilson and Bryan's made all the trouble[.]"[89] For Michael North, the appropriation of dialect by Pound and Eliot was designed to cultivate an intellectual intimacy and collusion outside of the "London literary establishment" even as "the linguistic tool they use to mock the literary establishment is in fact part of that establishment".[90] Composed, literally, whilst occupying a liminal space between England and the U.S., this epistolary display of dialectical mimicry rehearses the outside-within identity that Eliot would craft as an intellectual and professional position, one which reaches its apotheosis in his role as a cultural ambassador for the British Council. Here, as in the Possum-Rabbit letters, dialect becomes a tool for linguistic and social performance: whilst it allows, as North suggests, for "both rebellion and a reinforced community", the complex dialogic interplay at work in this decontextualized fragment serves to establish an illusion of political sympathy and assumption of intimacy between Eliot and his speaker, even while the objective of Wilson's policy to open up a free market and to establish a degree of social parity in trade itself becomes parodied in the

[87] TSE to Henry Eliot, November 5, 1916, *Letters* I, 73-4.
[88] Henry Ware Eliot to Thomas Lamb Eliot, January 3, 1919, *Letters I*, 314.
[89] TSE to Eleanor Hinkley, July 7, 1914, *Letters I*, 43-44.
[90] Michael North, "The Dialect in/of Modernism: Pound and Eliot's Racial Masquerade." *American Literary History* 4, no. 1 (Spring, 1992):24 77, 79.

caricatured speech and dialectical dissonance of this speaker.[91] The racial inflections of "genlman" and "hisself" encounter the acoustical pretensions to a merchant class that resonate in the practiced idiomatic phrases "he knows how business is" and "he's connected with". Such dissonance, however, becomes a means by which the resistance to the Tariff reform itself becomes practiced and performed, a stock response by those from aspirational merchants from "the West" where "Tour", explains Eliot, is "pronounced Tewer". Indeed, the force of this resistance is diminished through Eliot's rather derogatory use of a conflated dialect, which reveals resistance to the Tariff as a form of posturing, or, to continue in this idiom, of a sort of socio-linguistic insider trading.

What this exchange showcases is the strategic narrative position that Eliot adopts, which allows him to overhear or witness a reaction of political policy without the onus of directly intervening or investing himself in that dialogue. The use of parody immediately elevates his position to a benign, albeit analytical observer, even as he uses a semaphoric gesture – "pointing at me" – to signal the speaker's perception of his centrality to the conversation ("he's connected with the buildin trades hisself"). Indeed, this is perhaps one of the earliest instances of Eliot's outside-within position adopted against political partiality, which would, to a large extent, define his public intellectual voice. Yet, significantly, what it also does through gentle parody is to cautiously identify the resistance to the tariff as an artificial, acquirable posture, a cautiousness that nevertheless sets himself aside from the family resistance to tariff reform. Indeed, Wilson's tariff policy became a signature point of resentment for Eliot's family, who were perhaps more immediately concerned with its impact on the family business. Writing to his mother in April 1917 following Wilson's declaration of war against Germany, Eliot asks rather tentatively,

> Do you like Wilson any better? I am sure that it was the right thing, and had been expecting it for some little time. […] You will be having all the excitement and bustle of war without the horrors and despairs – except those which will follow from taxation.[92]

Eliot's analogising of the "horrors and despairs" of the war with those of taxation, whilst profoundly insensitive, show him to be offsetting his support for Wilson against his abhorrence for almost any form of taxation. Although in the first letter

---

[91] North, 88.
[92] TSE to his Mother, April 11, 1917, *Letters* I, 192-193.

Eliot can be seen to align with Wilson on the erosion of the tariff system, this was not incompatible with his criticism of the President for introducing income tax by way of mitigating the financial losses suffered by central government as a result of tariff reductions. Such a neutralizing tone he also affects in a letter the following year in which, unlike his brother who desired to see Wilson unmasked as the enemy of industry, he attempts to persuade his mother of the positive reputation Wilson enjoyed in Europe:

> I do not believe that people in America realise how much Wilson's policy has done to inspire respect for America abroad. […] I don't think much of the Democratic party, but I hope it will survive long enough to see the satisfaction of the peace negotiations along Wilson lines.[93]

Here, too, his support for Wilson's plans for reconstruction is counterbalanced by a blunt rejection of a group politics, but the "lines" along which Wilson was seeking to institute a new era of peace were underpinned not only by a common understanding of democratic government, but also by open markets.[94] Indeed, point three of Wilson's "Fourteen Points" speech from January 1918 foregrounds what he saw to be the essential "removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

Taxation, and particularly income tax, develops into a quite separate concern for Eliot, woven as it was into the fabric of citizenship, a point which I will discuss in more depth below. Here, however, I want to suggest that Eliot's support for tariff reform, even as it stood somewhat anxiously in front of his family's desire for economic protectionism, was a necessary breach of family politics in pursuit of the freedom and autonomy of literary production. It was an anxiety that expressed itself quite publicly when, in November 1918, Eliot wrote "[a]s an American of some years' residence in this country" to the Liberal-leaning journal *The Nation* in November 1918, "compelled to call attention to the conflict actually taking place between President Wilson and his domestic opponents".[95] Concerned that readers would misinterpret the nationalist programme of Wilson's electoral adversary, the

---

[93] TSE to his Mother, December 29, 1918, *Letters I*, 312.
[94] Carole Fink, "The Peace Settlement, 1919-1939." In *A Companion to World War I*, ed. John Horne, (Chichester and New Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 542, accessed 29 March, 2014, http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=254828.
[95] TSE to The Editor of *The Nation*, November 9, 1918, *Letters I*, 294-5.

Republican Henry Cabot Lodge, Eliot invokes Lodge's opposition to the fundamental liberal principle of free trade, explaining that Lodge represents the "'Old Guard' of his party [which] is traditionally associated with a high protective tariff". Unlike Wilson, Lodge would not be prepared to "sacrifice business interests to international amity": an economic level playing field was seen in the Wilson programme for peace not as a requisite baseline for democracy, but as its first defence against aggressive imperialism. Eliot surmised that "the economic interests" of the U.S. and Britain were "compatible, but not identical", with "difficulties to be solved, and suspicions to be dispelled".

Where these suspicions and, above all, the disparity in the trade relations between the two nations emerged most vividly for Eliot was in the uneven terrain of copyright and tariffs for the import of books. Indeed, the conditions of the 1891 Chase Act in the U.S. meant that copyright was only conferred on international authors (including those from Britain) whose work was either published in the U.S. first or else manufactured there, a condition which acted as a protectionist policy for U.S. printers and publishers. Pound, writing a month earlier in *The New Age* in October 1918, like Eliot saw the new *entente cordiale* between Britain and the U.S. as an opportunity to institute what he referred to as "reciprocal copyright".[96] "The stupidity of the copyright regulations is most deleterious to America's relations with foreign countries," he argues, and greater parity in copyright laws between the nations was as important as the "elimination of the import duty on books" to the "mental health" of the nation. For Lawrence Rainey, writing in *Institutions of Modernism*, "modernism" itself "is a strategy" whereby a work of art is in control of the way that it becomes a commodity, where it can self-fashion itself as a product whilst being "exempted from" what Rainey rather vaguely defines as the "exigencies of immediate consumption prevalent within the larger cultural economy".[97] The obvious questions aside as to whether "modernism" is either a "strategy" or an agent, there is a danger of misrepresenting the ways in which modernist authors engaged in a capitalist economy. The characterisation of these authors as fervent anti-capitalists, reluctant participants or helpless patsies, whose literary creations risked contamination and

[96] Ezra Pound, "Copyright and Tariff." *The New Age* (October 3, 1918): 363-4.
[97] Lawrence Rainey, *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture,* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998), 3.

could be degraded and enfeebled by the disease of economic consumption can be attributed to the prevailing scepticism of twenty-first century capitalism

The "unstable synthesis" that Rainey identifies as emerging out of the (agentless, according to Rainey's syntax) oscillation between "straightforward resistance" and "an outright capitulation to commodification" works to efface the apparently less seemly alternative that modernist writers in fact operated discursively within a specifically liberal understanding of free trade and property. Certainly in 1918, Pound was not marketing modernist literature as an exclusive literary sector or "a commodity of a special sort" as Rainey suggests: rather, "Copyright and Tariff" addresses the need for free movement and access within the marketplace to works which "have sold a certain number of copies, let us say 100,000", and which should, having exceeded this limit, be available more widely in "shilling" editions.[98] By no means, this article suggests, was Pound envisioning a niche market for specifically modernist literature. Indeed, Pound's own understanding of the synergetic relationship between copyright and the trade tariff was not only underpinned by a desire to see a comparable valuation between literary royalties and "oil stock" or "government bonds", but to eradicate monopolies in the literary market. Because nascent modern copyright law at once protected living authors and made publishing their works a more expensive project, the works of authors who were dead were deemed as more viable commodities, so that, in Pound's words, "dead authors…compete on unjust terms with living authors", compromising the potential for innovation to the detriment of "contemporary literature". Pound's was not a unique position, however, appearing to be reconstituted from Wilson's own criticism of the tariff system, which encouraged monopolies across the spectrum of trade, including literary production. Monopolies and the tariff, according to Wilson, not only promulgated a system whereby "American genius was competing with American genius", but also had a disruptive effect on technical innovation by "destroy[ing] domestic competition" and "mak[ing] it impossible for new men to come into the field": "The instinct of monopoly is against novelty," argues Wilson, where "the tendency of monopoly is to keep in use the old thing, made in the old way; its disposition is to 'standardize' everything".[99]

---

[98] Pound, "Copyright and Tariff," 364.
[99] Wilson, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress on Tariff Reform".

The analogy that can be drawn between Wilson's liberal policies on tariff reform and the dismantling of monopolies and Pound's own presentiments on tariff and copyright measures as barriers to the free exchange of ideas and innovation, became less oblique in June 1914 with the signing of the Panama Tolls Exemption Repeal Bill. This Bill reversed the Panama Canal Act of 1912, which had, in line with industrial protectionist policies in the U.S., excluded U.S. vessels from having to pay canal duties on goods transported from coast to coast. With the act clearly working to the detriment of British trade, Wilson, in a domestically unpopular move, bowed to the pressure of the British foreign secretary Edward Grey to repeal the bill. Remarkably, it was through this event, which sought to reinstitute parity in trade between the two nations, that copyright and tariff became, not analogised, but imaginatively homologised for Wilson. Indeed, the *New York Times* remarked on the symbolic import of Wilson's signing the Bill "with a quill pen used by President Harrison in signing the International Copyright Law in 1891 and by President Taft in signing the Pan-American Copyright Treaty, the Lincoln Memorial bill, and the act incorporating the National Institute of Arts and Letters".[100] Eliot, writing in a review of H. Wilson Harris's *President Wilson, His Problems and His Policy*: *An English View*, understood that Wilson's tariff reform was not only a practical issue of significant import, but an imaginative one, with one of his criticisms of the account being that "the Tariff receives a lesser place than that which it holds in the mind of the American newspaper reader".[101]

However, the imaginative and pragmatic yoking of copyright, tariff and the free movement of ideas was sustained by Eliot beyond the first decades of the twentieth century, reemerging rather prominently in 1953 in a more refined understanding of intellectual exchange: the movement of language. In what was by then a recurring theme, as well as an aesthetic and cultural concern for Eliot, the tariff returns as a figurative and literal barrier, this time in the form of language development. Language, Eliot asserts in "American Literature and the American Language" must be "in constant change. If it is changing it is alive; and if it does not change, then new writers have no escape from imitating the classics of their literature

---

[100] "President Wilson Signs the Toll Bill: Writes with Pen Used by Presidents Harrison and Taft for Copyright Treaties" *The New York Times*, June 16, 1914.
[101] Eliot [unsigned], "*President Wilson, His Problems and His Policy*: *An English View*, by H. Wilson Harris." *The New Statesman* 9 (May 12, 1917),140.

without hope of producing anything so good": "dead authors," as Pound proclaimed in 1918, "compete on unjust terms with living authors".[102] This lecture, delivered in 1953 and only a year before the US's ratification of the Universal Copyright Convention devised in 1952, once more draws attention to the prevailing westerly wind of linguistic hegemony: "In the long run, I don't see how you can keep the American language to yourselves. Britain is of course eager also to export, though baffled by tariff walls; but it seems that at present the current of language flows from west to east."[103] Eliot's contention is that linguistic and cultural currents oscillate in periods, but rather than these currents working to divide British and American English, this constant flux ensures perpetual fertilisation, or what Eliot refers to as "fusion". Tariffs, whether imaginative (that is, openly hostile to cultural infringement) or practical, serve only to interrupt this alternating current and so retarding the development of the language and its literature.

It would be misleading, however, to suggest that Eliot's own homologising of intellectual free trade and tariff reform was transported intact from those early journalistic years in Great War London to a post-WWII public intellectual platform. The "worm-eaten" Liberalism that Eliot invokes in Virginia in 1933 appears over a decade after the establishment of the *Criterion*, a journal which he founded on the principles of Toryism as "a view of life", a view to which he wished to give "the intellectual basis" which had been deceptively absent from the Socialist journals, such as *New Statesman*, which had preceded it.[104] This professed departure from Liberal intellectualism may at first give foundation to Eliot's later rejection, in 1923, of the editorial position at *The Nation*, an offer made by the economist and critic of the Treaty of Versailles John Maynard Keynes. Eliot's correspondence with Keynes in early 1923 reveals a desperate attempt to take up the position as editor, hopelessly anchored, however, to a set of rather torturous terms: Eliot's health concerns, together with his obligation to the bank and the uncertain terms on which the editorship was offered, eventually leading to a sympathetic Keynes revoking the offer. As a letter to John Quinn reveals in April 1923, Eliot was clearly distraught at having missed out on the opportunity – "a *disaster*" – resolving to take up an editorial position elsewhere

[102] Eliot, "ALAL", 8; Pound, "Copyright and Tariff", 363.
[103] "ALAL", 9-10.
[104] Letter from TSE to F. W. Bain, 3 September 1923, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot,* ed. Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton, vol. 2, 1923-1925 (London: Faber and Faber, 2009), 206. Hereafter *Letters II*.

should another occasion arise.[105] Eliot continued to contribute to the journal long after he had taken on *The Criterion* full time despite, on occasion, critiquing the rigidity of *The Nation*'s editorial position.

By September of that year, however, the narrative had been subtly changed. Eliot wrote to his citizenship sponsor Charles Whibley with still evident dejection, expressing his regret at not having "accepted the *Nation*" on the basis of having to compromise financial security for political and intellectual scruples, concluding that "if there is ever any chance – I do not hope for such good fortune – on a more sympathetic paper I shall take it."[106] Eliot was, of course, hoping to craft a professional standing as an editor through the *Criterion*, writing to his brother in 1922 to assure him of his "perfectly practical aims and motives for undertaking the work." Above all, he perceived the journal to be an antidote to that "problem of living a double or triple life", which in December 1922 when this letter was written was beginning to take its toll, caught between the worlds of the literary critic, the poet and the banker.[107]

However, the *Criterion* would prove to be more than an escape from his personal and intellectual identity crises: it would provide the very foundation of, indeed would be the qualification for, his undertaking of public intellectual work for the BBC and the British Council in the aftermath of the Second World War. Eliot's public intellectual role was rehearsed through the *Criterion*, and it was against the backdrop of the early twentieth-century construct of the public intellectual that Eliot's own understanding of that role – of that "vocation" – would take shape. In "The Unity of European Culture", originally broadcast to Germany in 1946 and appended to *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, Eliot reflects on the journal's objective to encapsulate the post-War literary landscape of Europe by appealing to reviewers and critics of national and international renown. Just as important was the aim to set up a network of critical dialogue across the continent by establishing reciprocal relationships between European journals such as the *Nouvelle Revue Française* and the *Neue Rundschau*. [108] At the very root of both of these objectives was the understanding that cultural progression and evolution could only occur within an

[105] TSE to John Quinn, April 26, 1923, *Letters II,* 116.
[106] TSE to Charles Whibley, September 3, 1923, *Letters II*, 203.
[107] TSE to Henry Eliot, December 31, 1922, *Letters 1*, 815.
[108] Eliot, *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (London: Faber and Faber, 1962), 115. Hereafter as *Notes*.

environment which allowed for the "circulation of influence of thought and sensibility, between nation and nation in Europe, which fertilises and renovates from abroad the literature of each one of them".[109] Yet what this fertilisation was predicated upon was the liberal precept of free trade, of the free exchange of intellectual and creative "goods" across state borders. Indeed, the journal's demise Eliot attributes not to the difficult economic conditions which encroached on most journals at the Second World War's outset, but to the "gradual closing of the mental frontiers of Europe. A kind of cultural autarky followed inevitably upon political and economic autarky".[110] The *Criterion*'s folding was ultimately the result of an intellectual and creative sterility, stemming from fear, suppression, and material hardship. The journal, which he had envisioned as the much-needed catalyst for the elimination of those intellectual border controls erected by the Treaty of Versailles, had been forced to make a retreat.

That Eliot refers, however, to the "gradual closing" of the borders of Europe's nations is significant, for it points to an enduring battle against the tariff system of critical exchange. By the 1930s, *The Criterion* had begun to suffer from the impact of the political tectonics taking place on the continent, so that "The 'European mind', which one had mistakenly thought might be renewed and fortified, disappeared from view: there were fewer writers in any country who seemed to have anything to say to the intellectual public of another."[111] As early as 1931, Eliot was joining in the Southern Agrarian lament of the loss of spirituality in what had become a "wholly materialistic" society: "coal, oil, iron and factories have altered the relation of man to his world", a breach not unique to the U.S.[112] Indeed, in his 1934 play *The Rock*, Eliot berates the liberal imperialist coalition of industrial advancement and intellectual enlightenment, which had become corrupted by the Treaty of Versailles's economic policy:

> Then they could set about imperial expansion
> Accompanied by industrial development.
> Exporting iron, coal and cotton goods

---

[109] Eliot, *Notes*, 116.
[110] Eliot, *Notes*, 116.
[111] Eliot, "Last Words." *The Criterion* XVIII, no. 71 (January, 1939): 271-2.
[112] Eliot, "A Commentary." *The Criterion: A Literary Review* 10 (April 1931): 481-90

And intellectual enlightenment
And everything, including capital
And several versions of the Word of GOD:
The British race assured of a mission
Performed it, but left much at home unsure.[113]

The disordered rationalism which had allowed and created the conditions for imperial expansion – the ordering of the position of God in relation to man, the writing out of the "inconvenient saints" – is here set in order by the transgressing of territorial boundaries: the initial trochaic foot in the first line of this passage becoming normalised through the proceeding spondee, which ushers in an English metrical regularity in the iamb. This regularity, however, is hard won: the exceeding of those territorial boundaries results in a catalectic foot in "expansion", upon which the first iambic foot of the next line is contingent. The process of industrial development similarly becomes a measure of disorder, the pyrrhic medial foot having a reversion effect back to a mechanised, more aggressive trochaic rhythm, the apotheosis of which is yet another catalectic (here masculine) foot. With the foundations for trade firmly implemented, the rhythmic bond between the exporting of raw materials and "intellectual enlightenment" is constituted in the specifically nationalist metre of iambic pentameter, "the ruling constituent", as Meredith Martin has suggested, in the "narratives of military glory", in "the countless histories of England that justified and extolled imperial expansion."[114] Yet language and metre, specifically an imperialist metre, can be seen to be not only normalising aggressive foreign policy, but also suppressing the moral and historical discordant narratives which threaten to unsettle it.

As Eliot would articulate it in his Virginia lectures the year before the production of *The Rock*, it was the "struggle of our time to concentrate, not to dissipate; to renew our association with traditional wisdom; to re-establish a vital connexion between the individual and the race; the struggle, in a word, against Liberalism[.]"[115] What was "left…at home unsure" in the friction between imperial expansion and homeland politics became increasingly apparent in the intellectual

[113] Eliot, *The Complete Poems and Plays* (London: Faber and Faber, 2004),151-2. Hereafter *CPP*.
[114] Meredith Martin, *The Rise and Fall of Meter: Poetry and English National Culture, 1860-1930* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012), 102.
[115] Eliot, *After Strange Gods,* 48.

landscape of Germany in the 1930s. Indeed, this revealing of a false economy founded on intellectual development and trade, in 1934, was both of national concern to Britain, as well as local concern to *The Criterion*. Between 1934 and the beginning of World War II, Hitler was systematically dismantling Europe's trade network, with the introduction of the 1934 New Plan and the 1935 Four Year Plan, according to Narizny, making "Germany more autarchic". Both of these plans were "unambiguously harmful to British merchandise exporters", the most significant impact being on the coal industry in which there was a considerable trade disparity between Britain and Germany: as Britain's exports decreased by 20 per cent, Germany in comparison saw a 33 per cent increase.[116] The trade disparity between Germany and Britain became increasingly culturally homologised for Eliot, and in a British Council address to the Anglo-Swedish Society in 1943, he once again invokes a discourse of industrial trade to argue that "cultural relations have their own laws. One of them is that every country needs to import as well as to export". He continues:

> Of course, there will be a greater give and take with certain countries than with others; as in trade, you may sell more to one particular country than you buy from it, but there will be some other country from which you take more than you give.[117]

In 1934, with Britain threatening economic sanctions against Germany, *The Criterion* bore witness to the inverse relationship between imperial expansionism through a practically militant approach to coal exports, and intellectual development and exchange.

Still, the conditions that were the death knell of *The Criterion* were also its stimulus: the tariff system was the god that brought to life and put to death the cultural and intellectual organism of a nation. As the Great War came to a close, Europe was left to survey and rebuild the intellectual synapses between nations, which had been decimated in Britain at least by embargos and outright bans on enemy literature. In April 1919, *The Observer* newspaper ran an article on the "War Work of the London Library", in which it describes how in the early stages of the War the Government, in particular the Foreign Office and War Trade Intelligence Department,

---

[116] Kevin Narizny, *The Political Economy of Grand Strategy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 296.
[117] Eliot, "The Nature of Cultural Relations" in *Friendship, Progress, Civilisation: Three War-time Speech to the Anglo-Swedish Society* (Holborn, London: Anglo-Swedish Society, 1943), 17.

relied on the Library as a source for Russian and German books on the politics and geography of these countries:

> Soon afterwards the Government prohibited the London Library from importing German books from Germany.
>
> It took the Library authorities the best part of two years to get back their permission to import these books, and then it was on the condition that none of their members should read them.[118]

For the best part of five years, enemy literature had been interred and quarantined, only just beginning to be available for inspection. Yet the War itself would mark only a partial reprieve thanks in considerable part to that act of freedom, the Treaty of Versailles. The "bad peace" which came about as a result, Eliot believed, of Wilson's concessions to the European allies, ricocheted, he later reflected in *Dante* in 1929, long after its having "separated nation from nation", with "the process of disintegration which for our generation culminates in that treaty" merely a continuation of the decline begun in the years following Dante's death.[119] As Carole Fink observes, from the outset the Treaty became "an emblem for 'victors' justice' and a failed Wilsonianism", with a very vocal German press lambasting the reneged armistice agreement which had been modeled on Wilson's "Fourteen Points".[120]

The Germans found themselves some powerful ally sympathizers, the most eminent of which, John Maynard Keynes, was immensely critical of any attempt to lay complete blame for the War at Germany's door, the War's having originated, he contended, out of "the universally practised policies of economic imperialism; it had its seeds deep in the late history of Europe." In particular, Keynes took aim at what he saw to be the wholesale destruction of Germany's industrial economy, which compromised the "economic solidarity of Europe" through the institution of disproportionate tariff systems.[121] Germany's economy was severely compromised, Keynes argued, by the fact that allied countries could import into Germany without having to pay customs duty, an arrangement that was not, however, reciprocal.[122]

---

[118] "War Work of the London Library," *The Observer,* April 13, 1919.
[119] Eliot, *Dante* (London: Faber and Faber, 1929), 19-20.
[120] Fink, 546.
[121] J. M. Keynes, "The Peace of Versailles," *Everybody's Magazine* (September, 1920): 36-38.
[122] Keynes, J. M. *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920), 102.

What the Treaty aimed at was a systematic dismantling of Germany's industrial economy, in particular its raw materials of iron, steel and coal. Instead, Keynes wished to advocate a "Free Trade Union" which would "impose no protectionist tariffs whatever against the produce of the other members of the Union" and which would "permit the continuance of Germany's industrial life" to allow for the re-development of its iron and steel industry.[123]

Both the erecting of an economic valve system within Europe and the glacial reintroduction of foreign literature into the market created a hostile environment for the intellectual cross-fertilisation Eliot prescribed for the health of Europe. Eliot's encounter with Hermann Hesse in 1922, Jason Harding suggests "was decisive in the direction the *Criterion* was to take: that is, a concerted movement away from the profound cultural pessimism of post-war 'disintegration and chaos' towards an attempt to establish a pan-European ideal of Latinate 'classicism'".[124] Yet, from the outset, Eliot faced the pragmatic challenge of establishing contact with his European counterparts, and, as Harding also notes, it was through E. R. Curtius, a German scholar, that Eliot sought to extend the *Criterion*'s reach. Believing themselves to be, as Harding phrases it, the "self-elected custodians and guardians of the European tradition", both men had to overcome the question of the disparity in the trade relations between Britain and Germany and the problem of hyper-inflation.[125] Obtaining German literature, Eliot found, was a sustained problem, with both a dearth on imports and the inflating of the prices to compensate for import tax making the vision of a "pan-European" criticism and readership an increasingly aspirational one: "I looked at the new German books at Jaschke's the other day", wrote Eliot to a Mrs Lethbridge in February 1921, "very little, and it seemed to me very costly."[126] In one of his first letters to Curtius from August 1922, Eliot asks the German critic to apprise him of the potential market for an English periodical in Germany, acknowledging that the operation would necessarily run at a loss before concluding that "[t]he difficulties of international communication are very great: in fact, even German books are sold here in England at prices beyond *my* means, and are only obtained after a long

---

[123] Keynes, J. M. *The Economic Consequences of the Peace, 265-6.*
[124] Harding, 203.
[125] Harding, 212.
[126] TSE to to Mrs Lethbridge, February 8, 1921, *Letters I, 540.*

delay."[127] Distributing the *Criterion* in Germany would prove to be an even harder task, inflation in Germany meaning that even the most bare-bones printing and distribution package would make the journal a luxury good, one necessarily sold through a German bookseller.[128] By 1923, the situation still hadn't abated, and had in fact become exacerbated by what Eliot found to be a press embargo on the reporting of developments in German literary life: "It is impossible in any country," Eliot writes to Wilhelm Lehmann, "to find out through the official press who are the really important people; the German writer who has been the most spoken of here lately is Ernst Toller whose writing seems to me somewhat overrated."[129] In his account of the Treaty's collateral damage to European culture Eliot was not alone, with the journalist Herman George Scheffauer reporting on the explosion of new German literature, at once "kaleidoscopic" and "chaotic", all of which "reflects only the feverish, uncertain groping for new life". The market was becoming saturated, "a jungle rather than a garden", with a surplus of books clamouring for the attention of the German public, the "new life" becoming aborted at the border in the absence of a fertilising contact with other European readers.[130]

If the critical landscape of the journal was to avoid provincialism through a coterie of multi-national contributors, it was through an elite readership that it would derive its authority: "as caviar to the general", explains Harding, "it should observe the law of the successful 'little' magazine and possess an influence on contemporary letters inversely proportional to its circulation".[131] *The Criterion's* launch notice firmly announced its departure from the "literary or artistic miscellany" which characterised such journals as the *Nation*, instead alliancing itself with "with the critical quarterlies of a hundred years ago".[132] This reversion to a quarterly tradition of the 1820s and 30s, however, alludes to those journals which predated the 1855 repeal of Stamp Tax, which involved "the removal of the related imposts on advertising and paper". Indeed, the removal of Stamp Duty was in large part responsible for the "overnight creation of the cheap newspaper", and quarterly

---

[127] TSE to E. R. Curtius, August 14, 1922 *Letters I*, 721-2.
[128] TSE to E. R. Curtius, August 28, 1922, *Letters I*, 734.
[129] TSE to Wilhelm Lehmann, May 14, 1923, *Letters II,* 132-3.
[130] Herman George Scheffauer, "A Panorama of German Books," *The Bookman,* April, 1924, 20.
[131] Harding, 10.
[132] "Advertisement for *The Criterion,*" *The Times Literary Supplement*, August 22, 1922, 525.

journals, Eliot objected, had "languished in this century of rapid production and consumption".[133] "With the leisure, ripeness and thoroughness of the reviews of a hundred years ago", Eliot would reflect in 1927,

> *The Criterion* was to join another of their characteristics, a certain corporate personality which had almost disappeared from quarterly journalism; it was to exhibit, without narrow exclusiveness or sectarian enthusiasm, a common tendency which its contributors should illustrate by conformity or opposition. It was to be up-to-time in its appreciation of modern literature, and in its awareness of contemporary problems; it was to record the development of modern literature and the mutations of modern thought.[134]

Eliot was to approach the journal with the same prescient perspective with which he approached literature: that is, with an historical awareness of the present and the past. The journal was to document and provide an archive for the intellectual developments of the time, an historical index of the diverse reactions to the accelerations in modern thought, which could keep pace with the "speed-limit of 'modern life'".[135] Where such journals as the *Nation,* in its pre-War years, had attempted to intervene in the political fabric of the country – the public intellectuals who had published in that journal had, as Mauriello points out, been instrumental in "initiating welfare reforms

---

[133] Michael Harris, "Introduction" in *The Press in English Society form the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. Michael Harris. (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1986), 107; "A Commentary" *The Monthly Criterion*: *A Literary Review*, 5 (May 1927), 187. In a series of lectures delivered to the University of Chicago in 1950, Eliot laments the emergence of a "new illiteracy" that has arisen from an underuse of elementary education. Besides the detrimental effects on literacy of the cinema and the radio, Eliot categorizes the type of reader then emerging according to a rather patronizing, even bizarre, criteria: "One can say that the educated man is one who can read the reports of Parliamentary debates, and the reports of important law cases, from beginning to end--skipping intelligently, of course. There is a larger number who can read a few paragraphs, if the type is large enough. There is an increasing proportion of the population which can read only headlines, of any part of a newspaper not concerned with sport or crime". See Eliot's "The Aims of Education: 3. The Conflict Between Aims" in *To Criticize the Critic* (London: Faber and Faber), 94.

[134] Eliot, "A Commentary" *The Monthly Criterion*: *A Literary Review* 5 (May, 1927), 187.

[135] Eliot, "A Commentary" *The Criterion: A Literary Review*,7 (June, 1928), 289-94.

in unemployment, housing, and health care" – Eliot's was by no means to be seen as an instrument of radical social or political change.[136]

This was not to say, however, that the journal would be measured by either political disinterestedness or, as *The Nation and Athenaeum*, in 1928 would suggest, the cultivation of a particular school of thought: but a "common tendency" or concerns, which were foregrounded through both critical convergence and dissension, worked to allow the journal to cohere without committing itself to a specific political position. It was through the "manifest divergences" of its contributors that Eliot could repudiate accusations of a dogmatic or homogenized journal politics, and it was through "literature" that the journal could discursively orbit mainstream politics "without tolerating any confusion of the purposes of pure literature with the purposes of politics or ethics".[137] The "corporate personality", moreover, was intended to consolidate social and political position of the paper, deflecting responsibility for the diverse critical perspectives away from either the editor or the contributors.[138] This most likely accounts for the decision by Eliot to leave his name off the commentaries until 1931, a year that marked a rather decisive turning point in Eliot's public profile and a shift in the Commentaries' polemic. Having largely harmonized his social and moral criticism in the editorial choir of a collective, "corporate" voice, it was through Eliot's 1932 contribution to the radio series *The Modern Dilemma*, rather than as Michael Levenson argues Eliot's American tour the following year, that we see the emergence of a more recognizable Eliot, one who, in Collini's terms, "even more than most writers, manifested a strong sense of occupying a position in the public eye".[139] As Eliot's voice became familiar and discernable to BBC listeners, so too did his Commentaries carry a signature, revealing at the same time the extent to which *The Criterion* was the hallmark, or the unique fingerprint, of Eliot's editorial hand. No other editor, he would conclude both at the periodical's closure, could take it over,

---

[136] Christopher E. Mauriello, "The Strange Death of the Public Intellectual: Liberal Intellectual Identity and the 'Field of Cultural Production' in England, 1880-1920," *Journal of Victorian Culture* 6, no. 1 (2001): 3, accessed May 13, 2014, http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/jvc.2001.6.1.1.

[137] Eliot, "The Monthly Criterion," Letter to the Editor of *The Nation and Athenaeum* in *The Nation and Athenaeum* 43 (April 21, 1928), 74; Eliot, "The Function of a Literary Review" *The Criterion*, 1 (July 1923), 421.

[138] Eliot, "A Commentary," (May, 1927), 187.

[139] Michael Levenson, "The Role of Intellectual," in *T. S. Eliot in Context*, ed. Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 67; Collini, *Absent Minds*, 307.

hampered by the "tradition" accumulated through the unique editorial aims of his predecessor, a concern which had already germinated as he ruminated on the folding of *The Little Review*.[140]

Just as Eliot's enthusiasm for the time-consuming task of editing *The Criterion* began to wane – beset by a "feeling of staleness" – the polemical positions he would articulate in the periodical's Commentaries were appearing to conflict with the collective critical ethos he had concealed himself behind at its inception.[141] This was so much the case that, according to Harding, by the time *The Criterion* was shut down in 1939 Eliot had

> increasingly appeared in the periodical as a public moralist seeking to address the important social and political issues of the day, but with a barely disguised distaste for the practical realities of parliamentary politics and international affairs. His editorial pronouncements, which sought to define and defend the conservative religio-political orientation of the journal, were frequently dismissed as sententious and out of touch with the crisis-ridden political atmosphere of the 1930s.[142]

Harding's conclusion is certainly not devoid of foundation, and evidence for Eliot's unrealistic view of, and occasionally detachment from, the social conditions which pervaded the 1930s might easily be derived from those essays concerned with the changing professional dynamics of authorship. In his "Notes on the Way" from *Time and Tide* in January 1935, for example, Eliot contends that "For most of my life I have been one of the unemployed: unemployed, that is, for the things I wanted to do, and employed only in work that some number of other men could have done as well as I".[143]

Since Eliot had made the decision to "jump out into the world" to deliver the Clark Lectures in 1926, he had been steadily reassessing those public roles that came

---

[140] Eliot, "Last Words", 269. See also "Letter to the Editor of *The Little Review*" in *The Little Review*: *Quarterly Journal of Art and Letters* 12 (May, 1929), 90:
"If it is certain *The Little Review* is no longer to be controlled by Margaret Anderson and yourself, may I express the hope that it may disappear altogether? *The Little Review* did stand for so much that was important that I should not like to see the same title used for other purposes".

[141] Eliot, "Last Words", 269.

[142] Jason Harding, "Keeping Critical Thought Alive: Eliot's Editorship of the *Criterion,*" in *A Companion to T. S. Eliot,* ed. David Chinitz. (Chichester and Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 397.

[143] Eliot, "Notes on the Way," *Time and Tide*16 (26 January 1935), 120.

under the remit of authorship.[144] By the end of the 1920s, the poet who would, in 1955, describe himself as of a "Catholic cast of mind, a Calvinistic inheritance, and a Puritanical temperament", was predicating authorship upon a Calvinistic understanding of vocation.[145] The disillusion, or staleness, which Eliot felt had marked his editorship of *The Criterion* and the prolific journalistic output in the 1920s, and which had sustained him financially, "has seldom", he was concluding already by 1935, "been the work that I thought most worth doing." The concept of the *right* to work, which in 1935 was doing the political rounds amidst mass unemployment, was not to be confused with "remuneration": instead, it was the right to work in an occupation from which one derived spiritual satisfaction whilst being "supported while I do it. In this I feel at one with the members of monastic orders, although I have not their high standard of austerity".[146] For Eliot, professional writers were not merely those, such as sixteenth-century hack writers, who wrote for financial gain:

"I mean just as much a man for whom writing is an art and for whom it is his real vocation. I should in this sense consider you and myself to be professional poets, although we neither of us make a living by it."[147] Eliot's conception of a profession was a far cry from the off-the-rack jobs to which many had to, and still have to cling. Rather, one's writerly vocation, as any other, was conferred and mediated through a common religious end, the process of work, as he expressed it in *The Rock* in 1934, becoming both the means and the substance of one's professional calling:

> We build the meaning:
> A Church for all
> And a job for each
> Each man to his work.[148]

The mechanized notions of work inherited from nineteenth-century ideas of industrial productivity were compounded, moreover, through an equally industrial conception of mass education, which was "designed to turn out masses of industrial operatives and clerks, of the domestic influence upon whose childhood we expect nothing, but who we hope by some miracle of 'education' will become good citizens

---

[144] TSE to John Middleton Murray, February 20,1925, *Letters II*, 591.
[145] Eliot, *Goethe as the Sage* (Hamburg: University of Hamburg, 1955), 51-2.
[146] "Notes on the Way," *Time and Tide* 16 (January 26,1935), 120.
[147] TSE to John Freeman, July 16, 1929, *Letters IV*, 549.
[148] *CPP*, 150.

with firm standards of moral value".[149] Both the concepts of "work" and "leisure" needed, he thought, to be revised in order to free the working population from a mechanism in which all work to no discernable end or objective. How could poets justify the labour that goes into producing verse if the audience for whom it is intended has contracted under the strains of modern working practices, so that "the result seems insignificant compared to the labour?".[150] As Eliot would later write in his introduction to Josef Pieper's *Leisure The Basis of Culture* (1952), his was a generation "longing for the appearance of a philosopher whose writings, lectures, and personality will arouse the imagination as Bergson, for instance, aroused it forty years ago": how this could manifest itself, Eliot discovered, was through the cultivation of a distinct and marketable public intellectual identity.[151]

1.2. The Public Intellectual

It is significant that Eliot chose to address the foundations of this question as a moral and social concern not through print but on the radio in his first series of broadcasts, which moved him away from the familiar role of literary critic to public intellectual. Significant, too, is the consideration Eliot would give to the discursively powerful connection between delivery and content for a series entitled *The Modern Dilemma*. In Autumn 1931, C. A. Siepmann, the director of talks at the BBC, sent Eliot a copy of a talk by Christopher Dawson intended for broadcast, along with Eliot's, as part of a series on the political, social and religious crises which, as often in contention as entwined, were demarcating falsely dichotomous ideological paths. In his confidential appraisal of Dawson's talk, Eliot criticized the cerebral, overly-intellectual, approach as "too continuously abstract to make a very strong impression on any large public". Eliot realised, as Dawson apparently did not, that a broadcast on a subject designed to engage intellectually and morally an indistinct demographic required skill in communicating rather complex philosophical and political positions to what may be a lay-audience. Such an audience required a narrative firmly anchored to the "concrete" and the terrestrial, and, moreover, it required a voice that would

---

[149] "Notes on the Way," *Time and Tide* 16 (January 26, 1935), 121.
[150] Eliot, "Christianity and Communism," *The Listener* 166 (March 23, 1932), 382.
[151] Eliot, "Introduction" in Josef Pieper, *Leisure The Basis of Culture.* Trans. Alexander Dru. Intro. T. S. Eliot (London: Faber and Faber, 1952), 11.

keep an audience's attention on just those planes. The connections between points were frequently lost, or collapsed into the fissures between, the [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[152] Siepmann agreed: Dawson's talks were [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], with his talk for the series unable to [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], compounded by the problem that [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[153] Authority, as both Eliot and Siepmann realised, was conferred and intellectual identity formed through the discursive potential of the voice. The rhetorical landscape for this series of talks was not that of the highbrow intellectual: on the contrary, it was the ideal grazing ground for the "amateur", the new public intellectual.

The development of a national radio service through the BBC in 1922 was key to restoring a tradition of public intellectualism, which had been abruptly curtailed with the advent of World War I. The faith in scientism as a basis for moral conduct and social progress had been shattered as science and technology became a destructive force against humanity, leading Eliot, in the second of his *Modern Dilemma* talks, to insist that technological development had to be "controlled": "In some ways machinery degrades taste and sets up unnatural values".[154] Within the space of five years, as Mauriello observes, "the notion of elite intellectuals leading the English masses with unique insights into moral and social universals" appeared already archaic: "Without faith in rationalism, social progress, moral order, and a universal humanity, the very legitimacy of the public intellectual and his authority to lead the public was put into question".[155] Eliot's social criticism from 1931 onwards was, to some extent, a departure from this New Liberal paradigm of the public intellectual, one which, with its strong emphasis on scientism and the perceived "legitimacy of professional social science", had been promulgated by the *Nation* in the early twentieth century.[156] Cast into doubt was the scientific determinism that underpinned New Liberal intellectualism at the beginning of the century, and which,

---

[152] TSE to C. A. Siepmann, letter, November 16,1931, "T. S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[153] CAS [C. A. Siepmann] to TSE, letter, November 17, 1931, "T. S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[154] Eliot, "The Search for Moral Sanction", *The Listener* 168 (March 30, 1932), 480.
[155] Mauriello, 20.
[156] Mauriello, 16.

in 1931, according Eliot, was counteractive to human progress by absolving people of their responsibility towards self-development, whilst the Icarian hopes of the eugenicists offered only "very dubious short cuts to the improvement of the race".[157]

The BBC, then, was instrumental in reconstituting and modernising the figure and mandate of the public intellectual in the years following the War. Radio for the BBC's Director General John Reith was not only, as Todd Avery claims, "a means of restoring a common culture" to a fractured nation, but a vital medium through which to disseminate knowledge.[158] Like its New Liberal predecessor, the radio public intellectual was to be endowed with a "legislative function", sentinels both of taste and intellectual development. Entertainment may be at the heart of broadcasting, Reith conceded, but the broadcaster "should also carry the responsibility of contributing constantly and cumulatively to the intellectual and moral well-being of the community. 'The best way to give the public what it wants is to reject the express policy of giving it what it wants […]. In other words, if you set out to give the public what it wants you will not do it'".[159] Indeed, the radio, as Asa Briggs argues, was to Reith and the BBC's founders "an instrument of public good, not a means of handling people or of 'pandering to their wants'". As arbiters of moral and intellectual taste, moreover, "[t]he 'controllers' – and they thought of themselves as such – had a choice: they tried to make it responsibly."[160]

The BBC evidently had no problem in filling in its schedule with those both educated and willing enough to deliver lectures, and it appears from its inception to have capitalised on the vocational nature of the public intellectual figure. Indeed, as Briggs observes, rarely did the BBC in its infancy have to seek its lecturers out, since "the initiative for talks often came from them, curiosity about radio and the local 'prestige' of a performance serving as powerful motives".[161] Notoriously tight-fisted when it came to remuneration, there was little incentive for the BBC to offer payment to its speakers, a nominal payment being a single guinea until the payment guidelines were reviewed by Reith in 1924, at the same time instituting a new policy of

---

[157] Eliot, "The Search for Moral Sanction", 446.
[158] Todd Avery, *Radio Modernism: Literature, Ethics, and the BBC, 1922-1938* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006), 123.
[159] "Broadcasting and Advertising: Sir J. Reith's View" *The Manchester Guardian*, July 29, 1930.
[160] Asa Briggs, *The History of Broadcasting in Britain. Volume I: The Birth of Broadcasting* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 6.
[161] Briggs, 264-5.

commissioning talks by intellectuals and authorities as a way of reinforcing the Company's mandate as cultural arbiter. Reith was careful to structure the payment scale according to the objective of the speaker, distinguishing between the self-promotional talk, for which no remuneration would be given, and those lecturers solicited by the Company where "'the fee should range up to ten guineas, – this latter fee being paid only occasionally for specially distinguished speakers'".[162] In 1936, as Eliot was marketing himself on the radio as the amateur intellectual, the BBC was acknowledging him as a consummate, professional broadcaster, and, wary of isolating one of their most popular broadcasters, they offered Eliot fifteen guineas to deliver a talk to the school's programme.[163]

Eliot could derive cultural authority not, as Gail McDonald has suggested, from a reluctant process of "'Talking down'" but, by virtue of the medium itself, – which could "take on the attributes of an oracle" and cultivate a teacher-student relationship established on "discipleship" as one *Listener* editorial would put it – Eliot could develop an intimacy with his listener, who is talked *to*.[164] Eliot, as Stefan Collini has pointed out, "manifested a strong sense of occupying a position in the public eye", a position he retained through a consistent rhetorical return to the amateur, "often," Collini notes, "in the form of mock-modest disclaimers of any such authority, with a betraying frequency".[165] For McDonald, the "culture of professionalism" that propelled Eliot's diversification away from the periodical culture of *The Criterion* (which derived its culturally elite status from the provincial range of its distribution) towards a self-conscious publicizing of authorship as a mainstream occupation, compromised the very notion of vocationalism around which Eliot was not only reconfiguring, but also validating his profession. "In the quest to be taken seriously," Mcdonald argues, "artists risked losing the aura of mystery surrounding creativity, the sense of the artist as anointed, not trained."[166]

---

[162] Briggs, 265.
[163] "RB" [Programme Contracts Executive] to TSE, letter, July 10, 1936, "T. S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham. The talk that Eliot would deliver would be "The Need for Poetic Drama", broadcast in November 1936.
[164] Gail McDonald. *Learning to be Modern: Pound, Eliot, and the American University* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 87; "The Oracle from the Microphone" *The Listener* 2, no. 26 (July 10, 1929), 48.
[165] Collini, *Absent Minds,* 307-8.
[166] McDonald, 105.

Yet it was through the usurpation of the "expert", as a figure in contemporary society so out of touch with the "art" of life, that the vocational hallmark of authorship could be invoked. In the first of the broadcasts making up *The Modern Dilemma* series, Eliot salutes the "the age of the amateur" in a period in which the public were in "dumb revolt against the expert".[167] The wording here is telling, for it works to acknowledge the limitations of the radio medium which stifles the voice of the auditor, whilst signalling the authority latent in silence, a silence which, on the radio, amounts also to a resistance to listen. In this word-play, Eliot alludes as well to an anti-intellectualism which has emerged as the experiential gap between the public and the expert has evolved:

> But we feel that there is an art as well as a science of life; that the specialist is apt to exceed his terms of reference; that he can teach us how to put into effect a particular purpose, but not what purposes are worth having. We feel the need for a point of view from which we can see the world as at least potentially orderly; a point of view wider than the expert's can be, and a world in which we may accept our own tiny lives as having a justifiable place in an intelligible whole.[168]

The current figure of the expert, Eliot argues, is employed in the scientific execution of the mechanics of everyday life, but that remit does not encompass the moral stimulant behind the action. In order to bridge that gap between theoretical and lived experience, a new intellectual, who could adopt an inclusive and holistic understanding of the world, needed to be ushered in.

Yet this form of intellectual universalism was the residue of the New Liberal understanding of the public intellectual, whose "knowledge and authority", they argued, should be "'extraterritorial', that is, not bound to localized traditions of specific disciplines". Indeed, as Mauriello explains, the New Liberals propagated the "myth of the independent genius and ideal of universal knowledge" as a vital constituent of the new public intellectual, mythical figures which were, however, taken from the cast/caste of "nineteenth-century men of letters", including Ruskin, Dickens, and Arnold. [169] As much as Eliot and Pound, according to Sherry, could "see the right campaign (for civilization) being waged by its wrong (Liberal)

---

[167] Eliot, "Christianity and Communism," *Listener* 7, no. 166 (March 16, 1932), 383.
[168] Eliot, "Christianity and Communism", 383.
[169] Mauriello, 7-9.

representatives" during the Great War, by 1930 Eliot was still retaliating against those "current stewards of the cultural legacy".[170] Where Arnold had been revered by the New Liberals for his "moral leadership in the public sphere", the "revival of interest in Arnold", asserted Eliot in his essay "Arnold and Pater" in 1930, was a matter of "the companionship of a kindred point of view to our own", and not the reverence of "disciples"[171]. Like his Liberal predecessors, Eliot would nevertheless establish his own public intellectual authority within an existing Liberal framework of intellectual utility. New Liberal thinkers such as J. A. Hobson, Masterman and Gilbert Murray had, "through a complex process of association and self-promotion", revived the "memory and meaning of these past intellectuals" such as Arnold, and had in the process conferred upon themselves the authority of "an up-to-date inheritance of the legislative tradition".[172] For Eliot, however, the revival of a figure such as Arnold or the "Great Writers" of the nineteenth century was not going to provide that holistic understanding of the world required in the modern age: "The Englishman," he wrote in *The Egoist* in 1918, "completely untrained in critical judgment, looks complacently back over the nineteenth century as an accumulation of Great Writers. England puts her Great Writers away securely in a Safe Deposit Vault, and curls to sleep like Fafner. There they go rotten".[173] Instead, he turned to the intellectuals, poets and philosophers of the seventeenth century.

In 1931, C. A. Siepmann once again wrote to Eliot to invite him to participate (alongside another prominent literary intellectual of the time, Bonamy Dobrée) in a series of talks to mark the third centenary of Dryden's birth.[174] Just as the *Nation* group had been "responsible for producing, advertising, and leading a series of festivals commemorating 'great' nineteenth-century men of letters", so too were the BBC involved in reviving the reputations of great authors and thinkers.[175] A year earlier, Eliot had also contributed to a series of talks on seventeenth-century poetry where he had praised Donne's ability to move away from the "mythology" latent in Elizabethan poetic language towards a "new mythology drawn from philosophical,

---

[170] Sherry, 85.
[171] Eliot, *Selected Essays* (London: Faber and Faber, 1953), 432. Hereafter *SE.*
[172] Mauriello, 9.
[173] Eliot, "Observations." *The Egoist* 5 (May 1918): 69-70.
[174] C. A. Siepmann to TSE, letter, February 10, 1931, "T. S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[175] Mauriello, 9.

theological, legal and scientific terminology. A similar attempt," he remarks, "at renovation appears in some of the poetry being written to-day". This transition towards a scientifically and artistically holistic approach to language had produced a "direct conversational quality", had changed the dynamic between the auditor and the poet-intellectual. The tendency in Dryden towards developing a prosody of common speech which was engaged in "elevating ordinary speech to the dignity of poetry" is a concern which I discuss in more depth in Chapter Four, but it is helpful here to point to the correlative Eliot was drawing between the advancement of poetic language towards a prosodic representation of the vernacular, and the demands he placed on the new public intellectual to employ a register to accommodate a more complex and modern *Weltanschauung*.

The process of establishing a common linguistic and experiential ground between the new public intellectual and the auditor was embedded in the vocational understanding of authorship. If, to repeat McDonald's concern, by developing authorship as a profession, by exposing its mechanics, "artists risked losing the aura of mystery surrounding creativity, the sense of the artist as anointed, not trained", the vocational property Eliot endowed in the public image of the author ensured the maintenance of the perception of the author as ordained. Speaking in his broadcast on "The Search for Moral Sanction" in March 1932, Eliot clarified how the public intellectual role, as a branch of authorship, was embedded in the obligation of citizenship: "Truly, for me, 'work' means work primarily for the benefit of others, and for the community as a whole; and such work involves giving pleasure or amusement to others".[176] Indeed, public engagement duties were to be seen as distinct from the writing of poetry, which, as he articulated as early as 1923, was a product of *leisure*.[177]

It was through this lens that Eliot would become one of the most prolific and productive public intellectuals of the twentieth century, and the understanding of the relationship between intellectual development and public utility became refined and

---

[176] Eliot, "The Search for Moral Sanction", 480.

[177] TSE to Sydney Schiff, March 12, 1923, *Letters II*, 69. When discussing the dilemma of choosing between taking the job at the *Nation* and staying on at the bank, Eliot remarked: "On the one hand it would allow me the time to run the *Criterion*; on the other hand it would be a serious drop of half my income, and I should have to use the rest of my time in making up my income by other journalism, so that my *actual leisure for poetry* and for ordinary living would be no greater than it is at present" (emphasis added).

tested in the years leading up to WWII and in reconstruction. It was a relationship, however, that had its provenance much earlier during the Great War when Eliot would attempt to put to work his accumulated knowledge of the intellectual landscape of Britain through the U.S. Intelligence Divisions of the Army and Navy. This would not only prove unsuccessful but would also illuminate Eliot's transitional position in relation to national identity, which had a profound impact on his decision to take up British citizenship. When Stefan Collini writes in *Absent Minds* that "[b]eing foreign was a disability that Eliot worked assiduously to overcome" to integrate himself into a British tradition of public intellectualism, he underestimates the degree to which Eliot not only profited, but also derived his authority from, his métic position: his ability to at once inhabit and observe Britain's cultural and political landscape, to occupy a liminal position, as many Europeans did, in terms of nationality in the post-War period, became an essential basis for his British Council tours. By 1920, Eliot had come to recognise that the view of cultural degeneration and its potential to regenerate is best observed when one "Leaves the room and reappears // Outside the window, leaning in".[178]

1.3 Outside leaning in: Eliot and identity politics

In the American post-War climate, proving identity, as Craig Robertson outlines, had only recently evolved from being a localised to a federal concern. This process was formalised in 1918 with the passing of the Passport Control Act of May 22, which gave powers to the Executive to control the movement of U.S. citizens in and out of the country. From 1888, the issuance of a U.S. passport at a nominal fee of $1 had been considered a "courtesy," but increases in immigration and wartime concerns over passport fraud had troubled not only national boundaries but also the boundaries of American identity itself. The anxieties and uncertainty over who was qualified to verify a person's identity which still proliferated in the 1920s were compounded by engrained assumptions that formal identification practices were reserved for the "Un-American", that is "marginal and suspect populations – the criminal, the insane, the poor, and, to a lesser extent, immigrants".[179]

---

[178] *CPP*, 57.
[179] Craig Robertson, *The Passport in America: The History of a Document* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 7, 2.

Unsurprisingly, however, it was economics and the need to monitor the credit risk of individual merchants, rather than state or border security, that gave birth to the monolithic bureaucracy of border regulation. Not until 1913 was *federal* income tax introduced, and with it a burgeoning bureaucracy of identification that expanded across state lines.[180] As an American citizen earning on both sides of the Atlantic, Eliot was still obligated to pay federal income tax, a heavy burden on what were already straightened circumstances. As the letter to Aldington, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, suggests, the cost of being an American citizen abroad was considerable, especially given that, in many ways, American expatriates were financially penalized by the State Department for their ambiguous position, and Eliot's rather blatant allusion to diplomatic nepotism indicates a sense of urgency in his desire to alleviate himself of the financial penalty of expatriation. From 1920, U.S. passports cost $10 and required renewal every two years, whilst many European states had increased their visa fees for U.S. citizens to $10 in response to U.S. visa rules for aliens, meaning that passports, or the politically complex nexus of identification, had become an expensive business for the expatriate and an important source of revenue for the state. These costs were resented, argues Robertson, especially by those U.S. citizens "living abroad who, contrary to the wishes of the State Department, continued to use a passport to verify their citizenship".[181]

With the State Department reluctant to acknowledge the passport as a legitimate means of proving citizenship, American expatriates abroad were finding the experience of *being* American, of confirming their America*ness*, an unsettling and dislocating one. With the passing of the 1918 Passport Control Act, passports became obligatory for any citizen wishing to leave the U.S., a policy instigated during the War as a national security measure but which persisted until its temporary repeal in 1921. Passports as intended by the State Department were documents of surveillance – migratory and financial – rather than as contracts of citizenship: in themselves they did not confer rights, nor could they testify to the national sensibility of the individual. That is, they were neither an indicator nor a measure of a holder's Americanness. What they could do, however, as Eliot's letter strongly indicates, was enforce a financial responsibility to one's nation state.

---

[180] Robertson, 6.
[181] Robertson, 223.

Yet if the political institutions in America were still in process of reconstructing a meaning in the term "citizenship", American expatriates were by no means finding it easier to prove their national credentials in Britain. As Pound and Eliot hunkered down in London for the duration of the War, "resuscitat[ing] the dead art / Of poetry", U.S. citizens were obliged to carry identification when they travelled within the UK in accordance with the new regulations introduced in the Aliens Restriction Order, which came into force in February 1916.[182] All aliens, including "friendly" aliens, were obliged to register with the authorities, but the order also imposed restrictions on movements within the British Isles. Indeed, as Robertson explains, because regulation itself was by no means uniform across the country, many British residents of U.S. nationality found that they had insufficient evidence to convince the authorities of their citizenship:

> While some citizens were able to get a passport on appeal, there were many who became known as 'twilight-zone Americans'; unable to prove their citizenship (after living abroad for up to thirty years in some cases), they were thus prevented from moving in 'restricted areas'.[183]

Aliens were prohibited from entering "restricted" areas "unless he has in his possession an identity book containing duly attested particulars of the alien in question".[184] Although spared the ignominy of the "twilight" state of existence, as an alien Eliot was subject to the rigorous regulations that monitored and restricted his movement, and letters to Eleanor Hinkley and his brother from early September 1916 point to his needing to have had his photograph taken for his Identity Book in order to travel into Sussex ("it is rather good, I think").[185] For Americans who had long been established in Britain, however, prior to the passing of the new U.S. identity laws, problems of proving one's national identity were compounded by the U.S. State Department, which curtailed the validity of passports issued abroad and obliged citizens to swear an oath of allegiance before a consul. For Americans abroad, one's identity – constructed out of the materials and experience of the everyday – was

---

[182] Ezra Pound, *Ezra Pound: Selected Poems*, ed. T. S. Eliot (London: Faber and Gwyer, 1928), 157.
[183] Robertson, 192.
[184] "Restrictions on Aliens: A New Order" *The Times* (January 29, 1916): 6. See also "Friendly Aliens" *Manchester Guardian* (February 10, 1916): 6.
[185] TSE to Henry Eliot, September 6, 1916, *Letters I*, 163; TSE to Eleanor Hinkley, September 5, 1916, *Letters I*, 165.

therefore contingent upon the rather vague, undefined *ideological* notions of citizenship (as opposed to the financial obligations) which underpinned one's entitlement to official identification.

Although Eliot's poetry, between 1921 and 1925, betrays a preoccupation with transitional and liminal states of existence as he began to navigate the bureaucracy of citizenship, even before Eliot formally approached the process of naturalisation, he was more than aware, was in fact financially affected by, the fluid property of national identity. Although a property that, as I will argue below, he would eventually capitalise on, the capacity of a person to shift between national identities was actually an effeminising manoeuvre. The introduction of the 1914 British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act signalled the first attempt by the British Government to bring into common alignment the nature and obligations of British citizenship across the Empire at a time when cultivating an understanding of imperial unity was imperative. Incongruity among the different nations of the Empire regarding a naturalized citizen's ability to move between these countries *accompanied by* his new-found identity had long been a problem, the refusal of some states to recognise naturalization as a legitimate assumption of identity frequently resulting in the "extinction of nationality and to the loss of the privileges it confers".[186] Indeed, the Act sought, to some extent, to remedy the assumption that citizenship – or at least "acquired" citizenship – was a transferable and impermanent *category*, rather than a stable property of identity.[187]

Yet whilst the Act was intended as a means of anchoring citizenship to a multifaceted conception of identity, it was nevertheless underpinned by a gendered assumption of nationality. For the Act also stipulated that "[w]ives derived their status entirely from their husbands, and children derived their status through their fathers", a system of identity inheritance that was maintained until the Act was repealed in

---

[186] "Citizenship and the Empire" *The Times*, December 16, 1914.

[187] The efficacy of this Act was still contestable in 1918, for self-governing dominions within the Empire had the prerogative as to whether to adopt the Act or not, with only Canada and Newfoundland officially introducing it into law upon its inception. The right to confer naturalization was seen as a fundamentally sovereign one, and, as *The Times* explained in February 1918, dominions "have been very jealous of their complete right to refuse naturalization on grounds of their own choosing – non-European birth is, of course, the most common of such grounds." See "What is a British Citizen?" *The Times*, February 18, 1918.

1948.[188] Indeed, it was as a result of this Act that Eliot's wife, Vivien, was unable to secure employment at a Government office during the War. Eliot wrote to his mother in November 1917 explaining that her "having married an American" was a "complete bar".[189] Vivien herself clarified the legal situation in her own letter to Charlotte Eliot from January 1918, in which she shows a keen awareness of the gendered conception of citizenship as one which is at once fixed and mutable: "Although I have never been to America I am, by law, an 'American born' citizen – and therefore not eligible."[190] That women could be dispossessed of their citizenship merely reinforced the notion of national identity as an unstable, transferable, construct, contingent on racial and gender politics of alterity, and the residual fallout of this Act can be observed, is in contact with, Eliot's own naturalization certificate.

Indeed, Eliot's certificate is embedded in the registers of citizenship held at The National Archives between those of a woman of Portuguese nationality and one of German nationality, neither of whom, however, had been born in Portugal or Germany to Portuguese or German parents: the national identities of Annie Coelho, a Portuguese national, born in Cardiff, and of Helen Mary Michelmann, a German, born in Kent, were determined by their marriages. Because under the Act married women could not be naturalized British, and because their national identities were conferred according to male patronage, only on the deaths of their respective husbands could these two women reapply for their British citizenships. That Eliot, in seeking for himself a bureaucratic counter to the "foreigner" status, and despite now being fully aware of the transitional and mutable nature of national identity – and aware, too, of the effeminised position of the perennial "foreigner" – should find his own fixed place between two casualties of a patriarchal discourse of citizenship is somewhat fitting. For the purposes of this argument, it illuminates at the very least the paradoxical and conflicting ideals that underpinned nationality: both to pass between nationalities and to be divested of one's nationality by birth was essentially an effeminising condition.

Such narratives of identity politics become central in the account of Eliot's move towards British citizenship when considering that, in the months during which he was conceiving and editing a special issue of *The Egoist* on Henry James for

---

[188] Mark B. Salter. *Rights of Passage: The Passport in International Relations* (Colorado and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003), 87.
[189] TSE to his Mother, November 15, 1917, *Letters I*, 231.
[190] Vivien Eliot to Charlotte C. Eliot, January 6, 1918 in *Letters I*, 246.

January 1918, he was in direct contact with a transmitted notion of citizenship as inherently masculine, but nevertheless attenuated by its (effeminate) capacity to be transferable. Written three years prior to Eliot's initial application for citizenship, how Eliot attempted to conceive and figure national identity as an inherently intellectual rather than political construct is calibrated by this earlier discussion of the alterity of the "European". Given the tenuous conditions of citizenship endured by expatriate Americans in the wake of the 1918 Passport Control Act, which codified most of the wartime conventions which had preceded it, it is unsurprising that Eliot, in the January 1918 edition of *The Egoist* and as its Assistant Editor, should invoke, and indeed should dedicate, a considerable proportion of that edition to his compatriot Henry James. Pound, too, would contribute a "Review" of James's *The Middle Years*, his unfinished autobiography published posthumously in 1917 following James's death in 1916. But it is Eliot's front-page dedication which alerts the reader to the strange belatedness of this tribute. "Henry James has been dead for some time", Eliot opens with seemingly-casual offhandedness in an essay known for its infamous assertion that, "It is the final perfection, the consummation of an American to become, not an Englishman, but a European – something which no born European, no person of any European nationality, can become".[191] But in January, 1918, Eliot must have been alert to how provocative, particularly to a British audience, the notion of a "European" identity would have been, an identity weighted by religious, artistic and linguistic continuities and divisions, and which was being subsumed by a war which could have potentially altered the politics of identification.

A "European", by Eliot's standards, is an identity reserved for the alien. But this term requires a more vigorous interrogation than has thus far been conducted. James Edwin Miller, for example, perhaps somewhat myopically, claims that

> It is hard for Europeans, with their firm national identities, to imagine the kind of confusion of personal identity that many Americans such as Eliot experienced. It seems possible that Eliot became a "European" living in England in part because of this very confusion for him (who am I?) in America.[192]

---

[191] Eliot, "In Memory of Henry James" *The Egoist* 5, no. 1 (January, 1918), 1.
[192] James Edwin Miller, *T. S. Eliot: The Making of an American Poet, 1888-1922* (Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 44.

This statement is problematic on at least two principal levels. Firstly, the ambiguity that undercuts Miller's statement that Eliot "became a 'European'" is reinforced by the use of quotation marks to indicate the very uncertainty of this national identity. Max Saunders, likewise, has noted that "[i]t was, of course, especially hard for a citizen of a particular European nation to become European during the First World War," but Eliot's use of the term not only merely highlights how transient and unstable this form of identity actually is, but also how dislocated the bureaucratic discourse of identification was from an understanding of identity as defined by experience, history or a tradition.[193] If the First World War served a dual purpose of both entrenching ideas of a nation's boundaries within the minds of its citizens whilst simultaneously corroding, and at times engineering those boundaries, becoming a "European" was not simply just hard during the War, but a troubling form of identity before and after it for citizens of nations within Europe. By extension, if Eliot was seeking security in an identity that transcends the bureaucratic and geographical boundaries that govern national identity, then invoking the European identity, in 1918, as these very national boundaries were being dismantled or shattered and Europe being reconfigured, is certainly a challenge to the political paradigms of identity.

Yet if Eliot, as Miller asserts, was asking "who am I?" in 1918, his was not a lonely voice in the exploded void of Europe. Rather, we might consider Eliot's article as a re-examination of how a European identity is constructed not by the spatial relationship between populations, but by their experiential proximity to a specific social structure and its mechanism. Both Eliot and James, according to Simon Grimble, "are the true inheritors of the finest and most durable aspects of European civilisation, because they are unmarked by the petty nationalisms that divide Europe".[194] But the "petty nationalisms" of both Europe and America, which were

---

[193] Max Saunders, "T. S. Eliot and Ford Madox Ford," in *T. S. Eliot and the Concept of Tradition*, eds. Giovanni Cianci and Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 187.

[194] Simon Grimble, "Englishness," in *T. S. Eliot in Context* ed. Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 47. Indeed, a letter from Vivien Eliot to Eliot's father in June 1916, reveals the extent to which Eliot was exposed to open hostility and resentment towards America by the British. "There is a good deal of bitter feeling about America, over here. It is horrid, I hate it. I am afraid it will take years before it calms down. People talk in a slighting way about America." *Letters I*, 154.

played out during and after the War with visa restrictions and passport injunctions, *were* leaving a blemish pragmatically and ideologically upon Eliot.

For Eliot, what distinguished the European from the Englishman or the American, was the ability not to transcend, but to remain always *in relation to* both one's own and another nation and its culture. Careful to refrain from publicly assigning this identity directly to James, however, Eliot instead chooses to focus on how James mediates the European tag through his characterisation.[195] Tom Tristram, the appalling American expatriate of *The American*, is, through his membership of the Occidental Club where he gambles and gorges on the materialism of bourgeois wealth, and through his ignorance of the mechanisms of the French nation and its culture (his attendance at the Louvre is a matter of happenstance), is according to Eliot, "one of the failures, of nature's misfortunes, in this process".[196] For Newman, who desires to extract from Europe the best it can offer in culture, to "do what the clever people do", Tristram's criticism of America from his materially privileged position in Europe is decisively unpatriotic. Having ideologically dislocated himself from both nations, what Tristram considers to be his relational position to America, a position that he assumes permits his adoption of the role of national critic, turns out to be merely a fallacy, a member of that "large part of the reading public" who do not know "what the word 'critic' means".[197] James, in contrast, was "a critic who preyed not upon ideas, but upon living beings", could pull focus to "a situation, a relation, an atmosphere, to which the characters pay tribute, but being allowed to give only what the writer wants." As a European writer, James understood the way that individuals related to, or interacted with, a situation rather than to one another, an understanding that could only originate from being able in his novels to "maintain[n] a point of view, a view-point untouched by the parasitic idea". [198] Eliot's word-play, here, is no syntactical accident, for it positions James as both sufficiently immersed in a situation as to indeed develop a critical position, whilst simultaneously being able to extract himself, to observe how individuals behave in relation to this situation. Eliot transparently credits James with the European moniker in a letter to Eleanor Hinkley from April 1, 1918, in which he syntactically aligns the notion of "European" with

[195] In a letter to Eleanor Hinkley from April 1, 1918, however, he describes James as "more European than most English or Americans." See *Letters I,* 259.
[196] Eliot, "Henry James", 1.
[197] Eliot, "Henry James", 1.
[198] Eliot, "Henry James", 2.

this specific trait: "He is a wonderful conscientious artist, one of the very few, and more European than most English or Americans. I think he has the keenest sense of Situation [sic] than any novelist".[199]

It was these intellectual, or literary, qualities Eliot admired in James and sought to exploit in the war effort. Eight months after the publication of *The Egoist* piece, Eliot attempted to enlist in the U.S. military, seeking in particular a position in the Naval Intelligence department. His talents, he judged, emanated from that conception of the "European" by which he had measured James: that is, the integrated and observational position within a society occupied by the metic, one that he nevertheless elevates to a rather romantic notion of espionage: "There *ought* to be places," he wrote to his brother Henry on August 25, 1918, "for which a man who knows *England* well, English society, English business, *would be most suitable*".[200] Speaking of "Goethe's mind" in "The Romantic Generation, if it Existed" in 1919 as "an exceptionally sensitive collector of vibrations", it was an aesthetic skill on which Eliot chose to capitalise to secure his metic position in England, using that "'outside-withinness'", to borrow Sherry's term, to avoid a forced return to the U.S.[201] It is worth taking some time at this point to untangle the series of events that led to Eliot's eventual abandoning of his plans to take up a position in the Naval Intelligence section, for the political circumstances which underpinned his enlisting reinforce not only how ambiguous but also how inconsistent the bureaucratic notion of national identity actually was.

1.4 Eliot and military subscription

On June 3, 1918, just two weeks after the codification of the Passport Control Act, which appeared to demarcate the formal bureaucratic boundaries around identity, the British and American Government colluded to pass a Convention under the U.S. 1917 Military Service Act. This Convention constituted an agreement between the U.S. and the British Governments that American and British citizens of military age, who were living as expatriates in either of those countries, were obliged to enlist in their respective military forces. Yet this Convention introduced a curious caveat:

---

[199] Eliot to Eleanor Hinkley, April 1, 1918, *Letters I*, 259.
[200] Eliot to Henry Eliot, August 25, 1918, *Letters I*, 279.
[201] Eliot, "The Romantic Generation, if it Existed" *The Athenauem* (July 18, 1919), 616; Sherry, 85.

unless American and British citizens enlisted with their respective armies, they would be conscripted, instead, into the British or American forces. Time restrictions were put in place for citizens to register, and in a *Times* article from July 31, 1918, "Notice" was given

> that any male American citizen between the above ages [21 to 30] who desires to return to the United States for military service is required to apply before August 2 at the police station where he is registered under the Aliens Restriction Order. Americans who apply to return to the United States must make their own arrangements to leave before September 29. If they fail to do so, they will become liable for immediate service in the British Army without any right of application to a British tribunal for exemption.[202]

Evident from this report is the extent to which both countries were complicit in the engineering of the boundaries of citizenship: conscription, as a patriotic obligation, was disengaged from a nuclear understanding of citizenship, the constituent parts of which were being dismantled and transferred across territories.[203] "Those who serve in the British Army will have the same rights with regard to pay, pension, separation allowances, &c., as British subjects", the report added.[204] Far from remaining an "outsider…unaffected by the practical changes" of the War, as Alan Marshall has argued, Eliot found himself ensnared in the fragments of a disintegrating, non-linear relationship between citizenship and patriotism. The War, he would later write to E. M. Forster, "crippled me as it did everyone else; but me chiefly because it was something I was neither honestly in nor honestly out of".[205] Even in truth statements, Eliot's meaning is ambiguous: does "honesty", here, relate to his own conviction, or the administrative twilight zone of U.S. military administration? What seems pertinent is that the pendulum was already gaining inertia.

With the responsibility for an "invalid dependent wife", Eliot's rationale in petitioning his brother in securing "any job which I could get *over here without going back*" seems perfectly reasonable.[206] Yet one other factor that may have reinforced this resistance to serving in the U.S. was that those American citizens who returned to

---

[202] "Young Americans in England. Service Here or in U.S" *The Times*, July 31, 1918.
[203] Alan Marshall, "England and Nowhere" in *The Cambridge Companion to T. S. Eliot*, ed. A. David Moody (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 94.
[204] "Young Americans in England. Service Here or in U.S" *The Times*, July 31, 1918.
[205] TSE to John Gould Fletcher, August 10, 1929, *Letters IV*, 573.
[206] TSE to Henry Eliot, August 25, 1918, *Letters I*, 279.

their country were compelled to obtain an American passport from the American Consul-General.[207] Reluctant, perhaps, to obtain a form of identification that not only bound him to a suspiciously *federal* bureaucratic system of identity that was fast extending beyond state lines, but which had also been traditionally seen as a mark of deviant otherness – the stigma of the Un-American – by the end of July 1918, Eliot was frantically garnering support to join the Intelligence division of the Navy.

Although the earliest intimation that Eliot was aware of the new Convention is given in a letter to his mother from July 28, 1918, in which he denies having "seen anything about the Treaty you refer to", by the next day he was already attempting to solicit the help of the American hostess Lady Cunard through Wyndham Lewis.[208] Indeed, as the first volume of Eliot's letters reveal, throughout August Eliot called upon the help of a number of his friends, including Osbert Sitwell, St. John (Jack) Hutchinson, and Arnold Bennett (who was working as the Director of Propaganda to France) to supply testimonials for a commission in Naval Intelligence. By the end of August, Eliot was writing to his brother to inform him of his potential posting, his having "interviewed several people in the [U.S. Navy] office, and they said they would be very glad of a man like me in the Intelligence Department[.]"[209] Eliot's rather astonishing, grandiose positioning of himself as integral to the War effort not only has echoes of his earlier literary boastings ("I may be a beneficial influence," he wrote to his mother on taking up an Assistant Editor position on *The Egoist*), but it also alludes to a distinct and unique set of qualities which he believed he possessed.[210] The reversal of the authority-dynamic of the interview points to the value he evidently placed on his accumulated knowledge of the intricacies of English intellectual life as vital to the war effort, a prescient insight, albeit premature, into the role that that knowledge would actually play in World War II.

In September, 1918, having been declared unfit for active service due to a congenital hernia, Eliot wrote to John Quinn to ask him to write one of three American testimonials needed to gain access to the Army Intelligence Department. Anxious to "get into the service in some way in which my brains and qualifications, such as they are, would be useful", and confident that the army would appreciate the

---

[207] "Young Americans in England. Service Here or in U.S" *The Times*, July 31, 1918.
[208] TSE to his Mother, July 28, 1918, *Letters 1*, 273; TSE to Wyndham Lewis, [29 July?, 1918], *Letters I*, 273.
[209] TSE to his brother, August 25, 1918, *Letters I,* 278.
[210] TSE to his Mother, May 13, 1917, *Letters I*, 198-9.

expertise of someone "who [knew] Europe and England well", Eliot nevertheless anticipated another advantage to enlisting as a commissioned officer. Whilst a number of Eliot's contemporaries would derive artistic material from their experience or observations of the war, for Eliot it was to afford him the "leisure for serious work and freedom from anxiety": it was to serve as a reprieve, he thought, from the hardships of having to "make a living under wartime conditions".[211] This statement invites attention because it locates an origin for Eliot's understanding of artistic production in relation to "work", where "idleness" as opposed to "leisure" is the binary of "work", an understanding that he developed into a fully-fledged thesis in the second of *The Modern Dilemma* talks he delivered on the radio in 1932. In this broadcast, Eliot underpins his definition of "work" with a strong moral impetus and social obligation, its objective being "for the benefit of others, and for the community as a whole", and the end product designed to provide "pleasure or amusement to others". Gone was the author-centred notion of literary production that prioritised reputation and self-fulfilment, replaced instead by the vocational imperative of the "monastic" sort discussed above. Furthermore, he dismisses the definition of "work" that correlates financial remuneration and labour (the residue, he thought, of nineteenth-century industrial psychology), where, "[w]ith such a doctrine of work, you will have, as the chief alternative, idleness".[212] Unlike "leisure", which should be the "alternative" to socially beneficial informed notion of work, "idleness" has no productive value or measurable output: it contributes neither to the development of the individual nor to the community.

Yet what might appear to be an opportunistic move on Eliot's part to profit from what he thought would be greater leisure time in the Intelligence Division, may have been a manifestation of the idea that producing literature was of social benefit. Over thirty years later, Eliot would reflect in the final lecture of the "Aims of Education" on the analogy that could be drawn between good citizenship and the comparative relationship of work and play:

> A man cannot be altogether a good citizen unless he is also a good man; and the wholly good man must also be a good citizen--at least in the sense that he is one who cares for the good of his neighbors. The distinction, and the relationship, are similar to that between work and play. There is something

[211] TSE to John Quinn, September 8, 1918, *Letters I*, 283-4.
[212] Eliot, "The Search for Moral Sanction", 480.

> wrong when a man gets no enjoyment from his work; and to play any game properly you have to work at it.[213]

The desire to put to work his cultural and literary knowledge of "Europe and England" might be recast as a genuine attempt at a war effort. In the letter to Quinn, Eliot elevates his status as a potential cultural insider through a reductive assessment of the Intelligence Division's progress in both developing and understanding the import of cultural knowledge as a method of warfare. Such an awareness on Eliot's part anticipates the role he himself would play, via the British Council, in the more advanced and extensively employed psychological warfare in World War II and the Cold War years, but its nascency in 1918 was attractive to Eliot's sense of social utility: "From what enquiries I have made the work seems comparatively undeveloped yet and there are great possibilities of work for Anglo-American understanding".[214] The homologous relationship Eliot foregrounds between "work" and inter-cultural understanding is magnified here, and endows the critical reviews and essays, which appeared in such journals as *The Egoist* and *The Nation* during the war, with an official authority: they had the potential to form the basis of a cultural-warfare intelligence, signs of an early repudiation of Pater's dictum of "art for art's sake" as a basis for *authorship* as a profession, which Eliot would dismantle in the 1929 essay "Experiment in Criticism" and in "Arnold and Pater" (1930).[215]

By November, however, Eliot was forced to write to his father with news that his plans to join the Intelligence Division had fallen through. Having acquired, with considerable difficulty, the requisite three American references from influential advocates, including the President of Harvard, Charles Eliot Norton, Eliot was contacted by U.S. Naval Intelligence with the offer of an administrative role of Chief Yeoman with the prospect of a commission after a few months. Eliot proceeded to arrange with the bank to take a leave of absence for the duration of the war, only to

---

[213] Eliot, "The Aims of Education 4: the issue of religion," in *To Criticize the Critic,* 108.
[214] TSE to John Quinn, September 8, 1918, *Letters I*, 284.
[215] Eliot, "Experiment in Criticism" *The Bookman* (November, 1929), 226-7. In "Experiment in Criticism", Eliot nevertheless still defends the "simple truth that literature is primarily literature, a means of refined and intellectual pleasure." However, as the discussion has so far shown, this position would be clarified in the broadcast on "The Moral Sanction" in which he notes that the "work" of the author is to *provide* and *produce* the material for intellectual pleasure and amusement, thus separating out the intention of the product and the process of production.

discover that he had become ensnared in the legislation of selective service. In order to avoid conscription into the British Army and the divestment of "American rights", Eliot had, in accordance with U.S. legislation, registered with the authorities for selective service.[216] Indeed, it was the act of registration and the demonstration of an active commitment to American military ends – a commitment to his American citizenship – that Eliot found himself locked in the "outside-within" state on which he had hoped to capitalise. For the registration process actually worked to preclude his joining the Intelligence Division when, having left the bank and turned up for enrolment, the Navy received a telegram from Washington allowing for his appointment on condition that he had not already registered for selective service. As Eliot rightly pointed out, not registering would have meant forfeiture of his American rights, and it seems that, for the military, active service was to be prioritised over commissioned service.

With the American Army having "no claim upon me" and the Naval Intelligence Division unable to appoint him, Eliot found himself not only in financial straits, but also in a state of suspension, "[t]his constant deferment for three months", he wrote to his father, "has told on me very much."[217] The deferral of Eliot's application, however, coincided with the Armistice, by which point he had returned to Lloyds Bank. Nevertheless, his letters to his American friends and family suggest an anxiousness to confirm the patriotic role he would have been willing to perform: "it was not my fault that I had not been able to make myself useful to the country"; "no one can say that I did not try my best to get into Army or Navy"; "I at least did my best to get into some service", the epistolary "White feathers in the snow".[218]

In the years following his aborted participation in the American war effort, Eliot worked assiduously to build up his critical profile in England and his second volume of poems. As much as the assurances quoted above were designed to convince his family of his committed patriotism to the U.S., *Poems 1920* (*Ara Vos Prec* in Britain) was an essential document in proving to his parents his right to residency in Britain. Indeed, the collection was, he explained to Quinn in January 1919, supporting evidence for the "claim that I found the environment more

---

[216] TSE to John Quinn, November 13, 1918, *Letters I*, 299.
[217] TSE to his Father, November 4, 1918, *Letters I*, 286-289.
[218] TSE to John Quinn, November 13, 1918, *Letters I*, 300; TSE to his Mother, November 13, 1918, *Letters I*, 301; TSE to J. H. Woods, November 20, 1918, *Letters I*, 301; *CPP*, 39.

favourable to the production of literature. This book is all I have to show for my claim".[219] If Eliot defended his newly-acquired British citizenship on the basis that '"I don't like being a squatter"', the impermanence and uncertainty of one's position in relation to the state was a condition which, in 1919, was both a Europe-wide concern and a prevailing anxiety in *Poems 1920*.[220] "I have no ghosts, // An old man in a draughty house // Under windy knob", laments Eliot's Gerontion, the desiccated residuum, suggests Sherry, of an old Liberal "generation that has authored in words a war that its old men have not fought in body".[221] Indeed, the winds which "whir[l]" through the "draughty house" in "fractured atoms" are the violent dynamic rhythms of this poem, the "Trade" winds of empire upon which the war and its armistice were established. The "old man" of nineties Liberalism becomes at once the instigator of, and incapacitated by, the fight for control over the economic climactic conditions between the European empires, "an old man driven by the Trades // To a sleepy corner", where "driven" suggests his being both forced into retreat and spurred by these ungovernable imperial winds into a position of safe but questionable inactivity.

1.5 The Path to Citizenship

What of those, however, for whom inertia is an existence not chosen but enforced? Old age in "Gerontion" is both sustained and produced by inertia, and the "[t]enants of the house" who "[s]tiffen in a rented house", and whose thoughts are desiccated in a "dry brain in a dry season", become, as Eliot began to feel in November 1918, paralysed. As a "tenant" in Britain inhabiting an ambiguous position in relation to America - registered American, though ineligible for service to his country – the intellectual potential he felt himself to possess and which he thought could be put to use, was left to atrophy, "an old man in a dry month". Writing to his father in November 1918 in a state of suspension, "paralysed by rapid occurrences", he concludes that "[t]his constant deferment for three months has told on me very much; I feel years older than I did in July!".[222] *Poems 1920* began to take shape amidst a Europe that was also caught between two worlds, particularly those Baltic countries, which became sites of contested occupation between Bolshevist Russia and

---

[219] TSE to John Quinn, January 6, 1919, *Letters I*, 315.
[220] Quoted in Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1984): 165.
[221] *CPP*, 38; Sherry, 208.
[222] TSE to his Father, November 4, 1928, *Letters I*, 286, 289.

the newly-enfranchised states such as Poland. As national borders were still being redrawn and disputed, millions found themselves not only displaced and forced into exile, but also deracinated. This racial liminality reoccurs in condensed and highly-charged form in "The Burial of the Dead" in *The Waste Land*: "Bin gar keine Russin, stamm' aus Litauen, echt deutsch" is the fierce rebuke, but from whom? Here, the subject themselves becomes amputated through the absence of the pronoun as well as the contraction of the verb "stammen", the contractions serving simultaneously to erode at subjectivity whilst protesting an idiomatic intimacy with the language.

In this one line, however, is a powerfully evocative example of a politically manipulated post-War process of enforced deracination. In 1918, at the war's end, Lithuania established its first independent national government, having been under the dominion of the Russian empire since 1795 until its occupation by Germany in World War I. Lithuania's independence was very quickly undermined by the advance of the Soviet Red Army, which, along with Lithuanian Bolshevik sympathisers, seized the capital and the east of the country. Concerned by the aggressive expansionist policy of the Soviets, Poland attempted to create a bulwark against Communism by establishing a federation comprised of Lithuania, Belarus, and Ukraine. Although the Treaty of Versailles would confer independent status upon Lithuania, the claims to the country from both the Soviets and Poland would lead to a civil war. In 1919, the Allies, who feared the approaching Communist bloc, "permitted new ad hoc German units, organized as *Freikorps*, to operate in Lithuania and Latvia as a barrier against the Bolsheviks".[223] By June, 1921, as Lloyd George delivered the opening speech to a meeting of Empire representatives, Lithuania's borders were still in dispute, and, as Eliot's speaker clearly shows, the claims to its territory had ramifying effects on nationality. For this speaker, identity is a tripartite construct formed through negation (*not* Russian), territorial origin (the horticultural etymology of the verb *stammen* being the noun *der Stamm*, that is "root" or "trunk"), and cultural authenticity (*real* German). In 1921, the year in which Eliot would initiate British citizenship, the narratives of European identities were palimpsestic, protean, and, as Eliot's Lithuanian attests, the synapses between the political and felt identity were often scrambled.

---

[223] Stanley G. Payne, *Civil War in Europe, 1905-1949* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 48.

It was amidst these political manoeuvrings of nationality that Eliot would decide to file for British citizenship. This move, however, also coincided with Eliot's plans to launch *The Criterion*, which would become a vital catalyst in the reactivation of his application for naturalization. The periodical was intended, as discussed earlier, not only to establish his reputation in Britain as an editor, but also as a "partial way out of my problem of living a double or triple life".[224] Two months after Lady Rothermere had signed an agreement on the terms of *The Criterion*, and on the same day that Eliot likely wrote to Aldington on October 14, 1921, citing U.S. income tax as a motivation to obtain British citizenship, he completed a questionnaire, "Naturalization Form 6", which began the process of citizenship, and which was witnessed by Charles Haigh-Wood.[225] Three days later, on October 17, by which time Eliot was already in Margate recuperating from a breakdown and beginning work on *The Waste Land*, Haigh-Wood completed a "Declaration of Reference" form in support of Eliot's application, which was, for reasons that will soon become clear, re-declared on January 28, 1927.[226] From October 17, Eliot's progress with citizenship was temporarily halted as he recuperated in Lausanne and dealt with his wife's illness, until on March 3, 1922, Sydney Waterlow signed a Declaration form, followed exactly a month later by Henry Crofton, the manager of Lloyds Bank, on April 3.[227] This date, however, marks the beginning of a three-year hiatus in Eliot's application, which would not be taken up again until June 1925. The specific reasons for this interruption are not entirely clear, the explanation given to The Home Office in November 1925 being [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[228]

In 1923, despite having a position at Lloyds that paid relatively well and an editorial position on a fledgling quarterly periodical, Eliot's status in Britain was far from settled. Anxious, as Ackroyd points out, to leave Lloyds in favour of a position better suited to his literary pursuits, the demands of his wife's illness necessitated his

---

[224] TSE to Henry Eliot, December 31, 1922, *Letters I*, 815.
[225] "Form A: British Nationality and Status of Aliens Acts, 1914-1918", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[226] "Naturalization No. 3 Declaration of Reference", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[227] "Declaration Form", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[228] Letter from TSE to The Under Secretary of State at The Home Office, November 4, 1925, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.

remaining in employment with a guaranteed income.[229] Certainly between these years the issues with Vivien Eliot's health escalated to a desperate point, and Eliot's journalistic output in terms of reviews and articles are testimony to the need for an immediate income. The practicalities of life, especially financial security, were a predominant concern between this period, but there may also have been a hesitancy at this point to divest himself of his American citizenship. Tellingly, Eliot did not inform his brother (his closest confidante) of his decision to take British citizenship until October, 1927, information he emphasised was "PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL", by which point he had paid his £9 processing fee and was awaiting his citizenship ceremony.[230] Moreover, Eliot's letter issues an injunction to his brother to conceal from his Mother his naturalization, and it's quite possible that he never informed her at all: "[i]f this shocks you, I will present you my reason; in any case, don't tell mother".

The absence of activity in the naturalization process, however, was potentially redirected into his poetic output. In the "Special Report" on Eliot undertaken by the Metropolitan Police, identity is stripped down to its naked facts: an American who possesses an American passport, who [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], who has a dead father and a living mother, both American, who is married with no children, and, reassuringly, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[231]

Like Eliot's Hollow Men in the poem of the same name, the bureaucratic process of constructing identity creates a dual reality in which the subject is at once constructed from, or congested by, facts, but drained of any meaningful and affirming content in the process. The poem was published in its entirety just five days after he had received his new American passport on November 18, 1925, and in the same month that Eliot had re-entered his application for citizenship, but its gestation had taken a number of other published forms since 1921. "Song for the Opherion" was first published in the first issue of Wyndham Lewis's *The Tyro* in April, 1921 under

---

[229] Ackroyd, 132.
[230] TSE to Henry Eliot, October 25, 1927, *Letters III*, 780. Eliot remarks here that he had "pulled a few strings with the Home Secretary", although this is likely to have been another instance of self-aggrandizement. Certainly the naturalization file gives no indication of his case having been expedited, and there is no direct correspondence to hand between Eliot and William Joynson-Hicks, then Home Secretary.
[231] "Special Report: Metropolitan Police", September 12, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.

the pseudonym Gus Krutzsch, and is plainly genetically derived from the cutting-room floor of *The Waste Land*. Like "The Hollow Men", which is a poem fraught with displacement and, as Christopher Ricks points out, a perpetual sense of in-betweenness, the momentum of "Song for the Opherion" is derived from the paradoxical inertia of oscillation, from

> this pendulum in the head
> Swinging from life to death
> Bleeding between two lives
> Waiting that touch[.][232]

Indeed, the poem is saturated by the grammatical mechanics of possibility: in the ambiguous modal "may not" and the adverb "perhaps", for example, but particularly through the use of the participle "Bleeding" and the progressive tense of "Waiting", which begin lines 6 and 7, which not only stress the hopeless and unknowable longevity of this transitional state, but also the process of depletion that accompanies this stasis. Like "The Hollow Men", whose publication coincided with the renewal of Eliot's application for citizenship on November 4, 1925, "Song for the Opherion" emerges just six months prior to Eliot's first official approach for British naturalisation (at the age of 33), completing a questionnaire, "Naturalization Form 6", witnessed by his father-in-law Charles Haigh-Wood, on October 14, 1921.[233] If in April 1921, Eliot was "Bleeding between two lives", hovering as it comes to be in "The Hollow Men" between the Dantean realms of death, or, as Lyndall Gordon argues, "between the claims of society and the claims of the soul," he was, it would seem, experiencing the burden of an unauthorised dual nationality.[234]

The gradual depletion of the subject in this early form of "The Hollow Men", speaks to Eliot's article on "The Lesson of Baudelaire" that appears in the same issue of *The Tyro*. Here, Eliot, with evident tongue in cheek, interrogates the "intellectual activities" occurring in Paris at the time, a "performance" he derides as being valuable

> exclusively for the local audience: I do not here assert that it has any value at all, only that its pertinence, if it has any, is to a small public formidably well

---

[232] Christopher Ricks, *T. S. Eliot and Prejudice* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994), 208; "Song to the Opherian" in *The Tyro* No. 1 (April, 1921), 6.
[233] "Naturalization Form 6", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[234] Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 109.

> instructed in its own literary history, erudite and *stuffed with tradition to the point of bursting*.[235] (Emphasis added)

In a letter to Robert McAlmon from May of the same year, Eliot recalls only ever having "the stimulus of the place [Paris], and not the artificial stimulus of the people, as I knew no one whatever, in the literary artistic world, as a companion – knew them rather as spectacles, listened to, at rare occasions, but never spoken to."[236] The "congeries of people" who populate Paris, he warns, "are mostly futile and timewasting". This portrait of a French elite, overstuffed by an introverted and localised cultural knowledge, and presided over by the largely vacuous "spectacles" of the French intellectual, could almost prefigure "the stuffed men", "the hollow men" of Eliot's 1925 poem. But it also points quite strongly to a determined rejection of "the idea of giving up English and trying to settle down and scrape along in Paris and gradually write French", which had once been, he explained to Donald Hall, the "romantic" intention in his post-Harvard year in Paris in 1914.[237]

And yet if we are to read the poem with a new understanding of the pressures of existing between two nations, belonging only bureaucratically to one and existing as a "squatter" without the "full responsibility" in the other, "The Hollow Men", as a composite of those editions written during the early years of Eliot's application for citizenship, articulates not only the unease of being constantly in-between, but the reductive capacity of the bureaucracy of identification to fragment identity.[238] For Christopher Ricks, both "The Hollow Men" and "Ash Wednesday" (1930) are "transitional poems, not only as transitions for Eliot, but as mediations on the nature of transitions".[239] "The Hollow Men" is, as Ricks implies, a poem concerned with existential space; that is, it navigates a shifting topography, one that determines different states of existence.

---

[235] Eliot, "The Lesson of Baudelaire" *The Tyro* No. 1 (April, 1921), 4.
[236] TSE to Robert McAlmon, May 22, 1921, *Letters I*, 563.
[237] T. S. Eliot and Donald Hall, "T. S. Eliot, The Art of Poetry No. 1." *The Paris Review* 21 (Spring-Summer, 1959), accessed June 9, 2014, http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4738/the-art-of-poetry-no-1-t-s-eliot.
[238] "'In the end I thought: here I am, making a living, enjoying my friends here. I don't like being a squatter. I might as well take the full responsibility.'" TSE to Virginia Woolf, April, 1924. Qtd. in Ackroyd,165. This letter is not in the revised second volume of letters, but according to Ackroyd, is located in the Berg Collection.
[239] Ricks, 208.

Yet, acknowledging that "The Hollow Men" took form throughout the early process of Eliot's application has the potential to revise our understanding of the pertinence of those transitions, not simply between states of death, but between states of identity, which entail sacrifices of self.[240] Even in the iambic first two lines of poem – "We are the hollow men / We are the stuffed men" – the figures are diminished by the second line, the iambic trimeter disrupted by the effacement of an unstressed syllable, but leaving what is nevertheless a masculine catalectic ending and so affirming the immutability of their condition. Symmetry appears to be reinstated in the third line, "Leaning together", in which the unstressed syllable of the initial trochee literally *leans* on the unstressed syllable of the iamb which follows, only to be compromised by the feminine catalectic ending that unsettles the union, and reproducing in rhythm the pendulum effect. The first person plural pronoun that binds these identities together, moreover, also implies their agency in their own shrinking, taking ownership of their condition. Indeed, the metrical order is imposed by their vocal proclamations made by their "dried voices", but these voices are also what actively dismantle the metrical and physical symmetry of these figures.

In the 1947 Harvard recording of the poem, Eliot intensifies this sense of fractured voices in unison: from line four, "Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!", to line 6, "We whisper together", he exaggerates the syllabic breaks using a vocal staccato effect, whilst suspending the level of intonation across these three lines. In orally realizing this disconnect, Eliot is able to foreground the distinctness of the two voices, which strive vocally, if failing organically, to dissociate.[241] All the while, however, he stresses the futility of their efforts to assert independence from each by maintaining the largely monotonous intonation across the lines, which inevitably fuse back into equilibrium through the legato effect that takes over from line 7 – "Are quiet and meaningless" – and which is enjambed into line 8. Like *The Waste Land*, Eliot's arid landscape infects the voices which intone it, fracturing and coarsening them, yet those "harsh and grating rhymes, as would / befit the dismal hole on which all the other / rocks converge and weigh" fail Eliot as they did Dante in Canto 32 of *Inferno*, the soft assonance of "Alas", "meanging*less*", and "glass" suggesting

---

[240] *CPP*, 83-86.
[241] Eliot, T. S. 1947. "Hollow Men." Performed by T. S. Eliot. T. *S. Eliot Reading The Waste Land, Four Quartets, and Other Poems*. Harper Collins, 2005.

submissiveness rather than the "lost / Violent souls" they do not seek to be remembered as.[242]

If Eliot's Hollow Men inhabit the parched landscape of limbo, Dante's corporeal traitors in Canto 32, from whom the Hollow Men appear to take their form, occupy an icy though equally barren landscape. This Canto, in which Dante, led by Virgil, descends into the latter rings of Inferno, depicts the ring designated for traitors (Dante's *Divine Comedy* was composed during his political exile from Florence for treason). Here are imprisoned the form and colour of Eliot's shades ("Shape without form, shade without colour"), "doleful shades" ("ombre") buried deep in ice, "who / were pressed so close together that they had / the hair of their heads intermixed."[243] Cranially fused, like their modern effigies, their dolour not only compounds but generates their coalescence as their tears freeze and bind them together, "whereupon they butted together like / two goats, such anger overcame them."[244].

Section I of "The Hollow Men", published alone in the winter of 1924 during a three-year hiatus in Eliot's application, coincided with what Eliot nevertheless considered to be a dry period in his writing. In a letter to Alfred Kreymborg in August 1924, he laments having "written nothing, but my 'commentary' in the *Criterion*. Otherwise, I have been speechless for nine months, until perhaps I have lost the power of speech. The pressure of time is squeezing me out, like the walls of 'The Pit and the Pendulum'."[245] The reference, here, to Poe's short story of the Spanish Inquisition suggest that heresy and treason were, however, evidently still persistent themes in Eliot's imagination during a period when there appears to be some indecision on Eliot's part in his commitment to naturalisation. Indeed, the epigraph to Part I of "The Hollow Men" evokes the effigy of the Catholic radical Guy Fawkes, whose treasonable activities have been traditionally condensed into a ritualised

---

[242] Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy: Inferno Part 1 Text*, trans. Charles S. Singleton. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989): 339.
[243] Dante, 341.
[244] Dante, 341.
[245] TSE to Alfred Kreymbourg, August 11, 1924, *Letters II*, 472. Despite having published "Poème" (Part I of "The Hollow Men") in the Winter issue of *Commerce* the previous November, Eliot would write to Scofield Thayer January 6,1925 repeating his anxieties of his lack of productivity: "The fact is that I have done no writing whatever for the last two years except the scrappy contributions and editorials which you may have seen from time to time in the *Criterion*." The "embryos" which would form the composite form of "The Hollow Men" "lie most uncomfortably on my brain at night." See *Letters II*, 566.

mythology, stuffed with the presentiments of guilt and hollowed out by historical elision. But effigies, too, are transitional figures and problematize the dialectical relationship between identity and identification. In his "Notes" to *The Waste Land*, Eliot acknowledges having used the chapters on "Adonis", "Attis" and Osiris" from James Frazer's anthropological treatise *The Golden Bough*, chapters which deal specifically not only with vegetation ceremonies, as his "Notes" specify, but more precisely with the burning of effigies, rituals which posit effigies as symbolic of death *and* resurrection. Modern day effigies, however, are important social outlets, subsuming that "prejudicial power" that Ricks attributes to the Guy Fawkes' Day tradition, a ritual extinction of an ideology that cannot be resurrected, only endlessly extinguished.[246] For Dante, traitors are prohibited from purgation, as is their potential for regeneration, and Eliot's effigies likewise occupy the liminal space between affect and progression: in their sterile existence, they fuse together the identity of their real progenitor with the power of identification, even as the artificiality of their physical construction betrays the illusion of that identity.

By the time of *The Hollow Men*'s publication in November 1925, the anxiety over the permanency of his occupation and residence had abated. A year earlier, in November 1924, Eliot had met Geoffrey Faber, the Director of the publishers Faber and Gwyer, to discuss an opportunity to transfer ownership of *The Criterion* from Lady Rothermere, who had grown tired of the periodical, to his own established firm. This idea had evolved by March 1925 into a complete assimilation of both the periodical and Eliot into Faber and Gwyer, with Faber's "tentative suggestions that, if we entered into an alliance for the publication of a quarterly magazine or review, you might join us as a Director".[247] Such a position would offer Eliot not only greater job security and a route away from Lloyds into work more suited to his profession as an author, but it would also allow him to take on the Clark Lectures at Cambridge in 1926, which, Faber argued to the Board, "will add to his reputation, and to his value as an editor".[248] Also writing in support of Eliot, Charles Whibley, who would be one of Eliot's sponsors for citizenship, opened with a high evaluation of Eliot's American lineage, before asserting that "[h]e is strongly anti-American, as you would suppose,

---

[246] Ricks, 218.
[247] Geoffrey Faber to TSE, March 9, 1925, *Letters II*, 601.
[248] Geoffrey C. Faber, "Proposed Publication of a Quarterly Review With some remarks on other methods of securing writers", *Letters II*, 623.

and is now being naturalised".[249] Attributing a strong anti-American sentiment to Eliot may have been an exaggeration, but it speaks to the cultural and political prejudice against America that was in circulation at the time in some of the major presses (particularly those supporting an isolationist policy). This letter, composed in December 1924, intimates that Eliot's position at Faber may have been, if not contingent upon, certainly an influential factor in his appointment. Indeed, Faber himself suggests as much when, in a letter to the Warden of All Souls College, Oxford regarding a potential position for Eliot as a Research Fellow in April 1926, he imitates the template of Whibley's letter of introduction: the American lineage traceable to Harvard's President Eliot juxtaposed with the application for naturalization.[250] Eliot's becoming more firmly, and officially, integrated into the intellectual and culture industry in Britain, then, was conditioned by, if not a condition of, his application to be a British subject.

On his appointment to the Board of Directors at Faber in April 1925, his application gained acceleration, and on June 2 Leonard Woolf signed a Declaration form, swiftly followed on June 16 by St. John (Jack) Hutchinson, a barrister who had known Eliot since his time at Oxford.[251] A letter from Eliot to Sydney Waterlow from June 17 requested that he sign another declaration form – "I am *now* only completing it, but have *lost* the form you signed" – and Waterlow, then a Counsellor in the Foreign Office, proceeded to do so on July 17.[252] Having gathered all his references, three months then elapsed before Eliot would write to the Home Office with his sworn statement and his sponsorship forms. Unwilling to elaborate on the "private reasons" which had delayed his application, Eliot nevertheless gives the strongest indication yet that his changing professional status, as well as his evolving position in relation to British intellectual life, was the catalyst for progressing with the application at this point. Having resigned from Lloyd's, he informs them, and having become an editor at Faber and Gwyer, he foregrounds two other important changes he

[249] Charles Whibley to Geoffrey C. Faber, December 7, 1924, *Letters II*, 621.
[250] Geoffrey Faber to The Warden, All Souls College, Oxford, April 11, 1926, *Letters III*, 137.
[251] "Memorial Form", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew; St. John Hutchinson, "Declaration of Reference", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[252] TSE to Sydney Waterlow, June 17, 1925, *Letters* II, 681; Sydney Waterlow, "Declaration of Reference", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.

considered as crucial to his application: As Editor of *The Criterion,* [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[253]

Yet another event would impede the progress of the application, one, however, which Eliot had foreseen in the same letter: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], he informs the Home Office, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. This delayed the process until July 13th, 1926, when the Home Office wrote to Eliot returning the declarations made by Haigh-Wood (prepared in October 1921) and Henry Croften (April 1922) because the Secretary of State [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Neither of these declarations, moreover, were supported by his own, so that not only did Eliot's statement have be updated and amended to take into account his change in professional circumstances, but Haigh-Wood and Croften would have to re-declare in order to support this new information.[254] To make matters even more trying, Sydney Waterlow had to be discounted as a referee owing to his having taken up a diplomatic position abroad as Minister to Siam. Another month elapsed before Eliot would respond to the Home Office from the Sanatorium de la Malmaison, where Vivien was being treated, with the news that Charles Whibley would replace Waterlow and that Henry Croften would, after all, have to be discounted due to illness. Clearly frustrated, Eliot requested that he make a new "statutory declaration" at the British Consulate.[255] In September, The Home Office negatively responded to Eliot's request, informing him that the process would have to remain frozen until his return to Britain.[256] Although Eliot would write to the Home Office on November 9, 1926 to inform them of his return to Britain and his intention to take the application forward, by January the Home Office themselves were forced to contact Eliot to enquire [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[257] This evidently prompted Eliot into action, for by January 27, he

---

[253] TSE to The Under Secretary of State, letter, November 4, 1925, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[254] Home Office to TSE, letter, July 13, 1926, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[255] TSE to The Undersecretary of State, letter, August 12, 1926, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[256] Home Office to TSE, letter, September 1, 1926, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[257] Home Office to TSE, letter, January 10, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.

had signed the Declaration of Memorialist form before the Commissioner for Oaths and made the necessary amendments to the original "Memorial Certificate for Naturalization". This Memorial had originally been opened in October 1921, with the explanation for naturalization being given as [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[258] In the new Memorial, however, the grounds for application had been subtly changed: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]".[259] In this concluding sentence, vocation, work and leisure – that tripartite understanding of mental activity in the modern age, which would form the basis of his public intellectual broadcasts and criticism in the early 1930s, here form the basis of nationality.

Although Whibley would attend Bletchley Police Station in early March to sign yet another Declaration of Reference, once more the Home Office had to contact Eliot on March 15 to enquire as to whether he was still proceeding with the application.[260] Ten days later, Eliot's father-in-law and sponsor, Charles Haigh-Wood, died, which once again threw the application into suspension. Finally, on May 9, Eliot's secretary wrote to the Under Secretary of State to alert him to the requisite notices in *The Morning Post* and *The Westminster and Pimlico News* of his intention to take citizenship, and to inform them of the death of Haigh-Wood.[261] The Home Office responded on May 19th to inform him that Haigh-Wood, too, would have to be replaced, as sponsors had to be alive whilst the application was still active.[262] Eliot wrote promptly to the Under Secretary of State in reaction to their letter which he [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], requesting clarification for what qualifies a person to be a sponsor [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[263] By June 23, the critic and *Criterion* contributor F. S. Flint had replaced Haigh-Wood as a reference, leading

---

[258] "Memorial for Certificate of Naturalization". Undated, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[259] "Naturalization No. 1. Memorial for Certificate for Naturalization", HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[260] Home Office to TSE, letter, 15 March, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[261] I. P. Fassett [Secretary to Eliot] to The Under Secretary of State, letter, May 9, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[262] Home Office to TSE, letter, 19 May, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.
[263] TSE to The Undersecretary of State, letter, May 20, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew.

to a "fresh memorial" being opened by The Home Office on June 24. Whibley would make a police testimony on August 4, 1927 in support of his Declaration, but it wasn't until September 12 that Eliot's wrangling with sponsors and bureaucracy would see dividends. In an interview with the police, Eliot's full history was taken, with a detailed breakdown of his income, including that derived from property in the U.S. Although the police records [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], there was one misdemeanor Eliot evidently felt might count against him: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. With no police records to support the claim, Eliot's brief foray into criminality was swiftly dismissed.[264]

Having paid the mandatory £9 processing fee in October, Eliot was sworn in before the Commissioner for Oaths on November 3, 1927: "a very disappointing inferior ceremony", he informed Charles Whibley. "I expected to be summoned to the Home Office at least, if not before the Throne. Instead I merely had to swear an ordinary oath before an ordinary commissioner, just as one does in ordinary life".[265] Given the tedious and protracted process of application, Eliot might be forgiven for feeling underwhelmed. Nevertheless, Eliot elsewhere expressed his desire to keep the move as discrete as possible: "I am not notorious enough to be bothered by Reporters etc.", he wrote to Henry.[266] Far from the "storm" and "furore" by which Ronald Bush, in the *ODNB* entry for Eliot, characterizes his naturalization, the only public witnesses to the event were the two compulsory notices in the *Westminster and Pimlico News* and *The Morning Post* on May 6, 1927 to announce the application, and an article, six weeks after the ceremony, on December 21, 1927 in the *Manchester Guardian* that welcomed "the first American man of letters since Henry James to pay us this compliment".[267]

---

[264] Metropolitan Police, "Special Report: Naturalization", September 12, 1927, HO 144/7484, The National Archives, Kew. The report also alludes to the interviews with F. S. Flint, Henry Crofton, and St. John Hutchinson who would ultimately, along with Leonard Woolf who was interviewed in Sussex, be the legion of the Eliot's sponsors.

[265] TSE to Charles Whibley, November 19, 1927, *Letters III*, 810. Eliot severed the umbilical cord with the U.S. on November 7, 1927 by completing a statement for the American Government "American Citizens who have acquired British Nationality by Naturalization (or re-admission)".

[266] TSE to Henry Eliot, October 25, 1927, *Letters III*, 780.

[267] Ronald Bush, "Eliot, Thomas Stearns (1888–1965)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [accessed January 24, 2016,

However, naturalization for Eliot was never going to be resigned to the quotidian, its import being extraordinary in the way that he would never fully inhabit the role of national insider. If the exile Dante could remain "none the less an Italian and a patriot", his greatest vantage point was from Sweeney's window. Like Dante, who "is first a European", it was from such a position that the real efficacy of Eliot's War and Post-War British Council lectures, delivered across Europe, could truly be realised. Indeed, it is to this subject that the next chapter immediately takes up, and Eliot's ambivalent relationship with Liberalism, which informed his belief in intellectual free trade, would be put to the test at the outbreak of World War II. Through the British Council, Eliot demonstrated his commitment to the maintenance of the intellectual trade channels. As the forthcoming chapter will demonstrate, the liminal position he would occupy at the edges of national identity would permit the entry, although not the immersion, into other cultures without the burden of an outright political agenda. That is not to say, however, that Eliot's lectures were not acoustically calibrated to the political sounds of the day, having demonstrated a sensitivity throughout his career to the identity-driven politics of Europe. What may astonish scholars, however, is how Eliot sought to transform the political cacophony into prosody of reconciliation.

---

http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.lib.exeter.ac.uk/view/article/32993, accessed 24 Jan 2015]; "Mr. T. S. Eliot Becomes British" *Manchester Guardian*, 21 December, 1927.

Chapter Two: The Pioneer Poet II: The British Council Lectures, 1942-1949.

If Eliot was "suffering the strain of living between two worlds" in 1927 (to quote Lyndall Gordon's assessment of his conversion anxiety), by 1948 he appears to relish occupying, to be identified *as* occupying, that liminal state. In April of that year, debates were taking place in the Houses of Parliament regarding electoral reform when a dispute broke out between MPs as to whether naturalized citizens should be legally obliged to declare their non-British origins on running for Parliament.[268] On May 7, 1948, Eliot responded to a letter to the editor in *The Times* from four days earlier, which had not only strongly criticized the proposals, but which had also raised concerns over the emergence of "two classes of British citizenship". Particularly prejudicial, the letter argued, was the requirement in the passports of naturalized citizens to "carry an endorsement stating the fact and date of their naturalization".[269] Eliot's decision to respond to the debate originated not from his sympathies with the detractors of the Bill, but, with characteristic irony, from his belief that to be *identified* as occupying a transitional state was in fact no disadvantage whatsoever:

> I am touched by the warm-hearted sympathy with which your correspondents Mr. Alexander and Mr. Fisher have championed the cause of the naturalized subject, and as one of the elders of that depressed class, I suppose I ought to thank them. But for 21 years I have carried a passport 'stating the fact and date of my naturalization' without being aware of suffering any disadvantage therefrom. I cannot understand why any naturalized subject should object, or why he should wish to conceal this information, unless he is the sort of person who has something to conceal.[270]

To be identified as a naturalized subject is to be viewed from the inside-out, as a figure who occupies the boundaries of a national identity without substantially inhabiting or fully assimilating into that identity. Rather curiously, Eliot associates this assimilation with concealment, where to be immersed is essentially to be

---

[268] "House of Commons: Electoral Reform" *The Times*, April 28, 1948.
[269] "Naturalized Subjects" *The Times,* May 3, 1948.
[270] Eliot, "Naturalized Subjects" *The Times*, May 7, 1948.

camouflaged and dispersed, and where to be on the periphery is to be exposed in one's totality.

Perhaps, however, this is unsurprising given the culture of distrust which pervaded post-War Europe, provoking for the second time in Eliot's lifetime a climate of displaced and migratory identities, and where otherness linguistically fueled Cold War rhetoric. And yet even here Eliot asserts his difference, for though he might belong to the "depressed class" of the naturalized subject, in this expression of similitude is the temporal marker of alterity. Unlike the recent Iron Curtain refugees of the Poles, Hungarians, and Czechs, Eliot is an "elder", being legitimate and established in a "class" defined by its transitional and peripheral nature: "naturalized" may here reveal its linguistic fallacy – its dual identity – as being both to make native, to be admitted into a citizenship, whilst, in its derivative form "natural", to imply something unaltered, unimproved. The process of naturalization, Eliot seems to imply, is not an historically effacing one.

For Eliot, as he undertook a revisionist approach to the concept of culture throughout the 1940s, the periphery was a vital vantage point. With the *raison d'être* of the British Council lectures being, ostensibly, not only the *exchange* of culture but the *understanding* of cultures between nations during WWII, by 1948 when *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* was published Eliot had through his lectures acquired sufficient experience to conclude that "to understand the culture is to understand the people, and this means an imaginative understanding".[271] Once again, Sweeney's window becomes a prop as a way of avoiding whole scale assimilation into a culture when endeavouring an almost empirical approach to understanding that culture. As Eliot goes on to explain, "complete" understanding by a cultural observer is unattainable unless the experience of that culture is itself "lived": and yet this compromises the objective integrity of the observation. Since "one cannot be outside and inside at the same time" in regards to a culture other than one's own, the best we can achieve, argues Eliot through an anthropological discourse, is "an approximation towards understanding which stops short at the point at which the student would begin to lose some essential of his own culture".[272]

---

[271] Eliot, *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (London: Faber and Faber, 1962), 41. Hereafter *Notes*.
[272] *Notes,* 41.

To be leaning in through the window from the outside, to imaginatively trespass into another culture, mitigates the danger of sacrificing one's own connection to one's native culture, and here Eliot draws on a curious, resonant example from his own poetic oeuvre: "The man who, in order to understand the inner world of the cannibal tribe, has partaken of the practice of cannibalism, has probably gone too far: he can never quite be one of his own folk again."[273] At this point in the explanation, Eliot footnotes Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Kurtz an example of a culture-hunter having trespassed beyond the point of return, but scholars may more readily think of *Sweeney Agonistes*.

Published between 1926 and 1927 as Eliot's move towards naturalization accelerated, *Sweeney Agonistes* is populated by the marginalized – Dusty and Doris, two women who tread the line of respectability – and the voyeurs of the margins, the American conventionalized "businessmen" and war veterans Klipstein and Krumpacker. The action of this short play takes place within the women's flat, allowing for the spatial dimensions of marginality, at once situated in and set apart from the cultural epicenter of London. Towards the end of "Fragment of a Prologue", Dusty leans out of their flat window – ostensibly from the inside out, but what is, in social terms, an act of calling to the inside from without – to respond to the calls of Sam Wauchope, who wants to introduce the two men to the women.[274] Having "hit this town" the night previously, the American tourists participate in a performance of manners in this stage-set on the periphery, the exaggerated politeness ("I'm very pleased to make your acquaintance" to "Extremely pleased to become acquainted") a ritual discourse out of place in this contrived space of feminine domesticity.[275] Like the student anthropologist of Eliot's *Notes*, however, Klipstein and Krumpacker are responsible tourists, remaining safely at the threshold of this culture-scene, aware of the danger of compromising the reality of their own cultures to this unreal spectacle. London, the two voyeurs explain, is "Perfectly slick", but their discomfort and alarm is aroused at Dusty's "Why don't you come and live here then?". "[Y]ou haven't quite got it", replies Klipstein, for, Krumpacker explains with the dexterity of the cultural anthropologist, their own cultural integrity is protected by living an alien

[273] *Notes,* 41.
[274] *CPP*, 118.
[275] *CPP*, 119.

culture through a native, "a real live Britisher" like Sam, who is "of course at *home* in London".[276]

Thus does the first "Fragment" end, followed by "Fragment of an Agon", which swiftly introduces Sweeney. Like Klipstein and Krumpacker, Sweeney senses the social license that occupies the marginal space, but he also gauges the atavistic potential of crossing the threshold. For the second "Fragment" sees Sweeney engage that "imaginative understanding" of the anthropologist, as he rehearses the role of Kurtz as cannibal on a "crocodile isle": "I'll carry you off / To a cannibal isle", he threatens Doris, where "You'll be the missionary" and "I'll be the cannibal". As the missionary, Doris threatens to "convert" Sweeney, asserting a cultural hegemony rather than attempting a cross-cultural understanding. In retaliation, Sweeney counters,

> "I'll convert *you*!
> Into a stew.
> A nice little, white little, missionary stew".[277]

The violent threat to consume Doris is to assimilate her in totality. Where the missionary role is to suppress a culture by dominating and then supplanting it with another, cannibalism is both a birth and a death act: consumption is a transformative and generative process, which, unlike the ideological force field of the missionary, is irreversible. Cannibalism becomes the end-point in Eliot's assessment of cultural transgression because it organically and irremediably transforms both the cannibal and the victim.

Eliot's signaling back to *Sweeney Agonistes* locates the embryo for his conception of cross-cultural understanding. Indeed, what began as a localized, even personal concern with the thresholds between two cultures, establishing for himself a fixed position along the margins of British culture even as he sought to be a British subject, this concern was developed over twenty years into a politically pertinent question in post-War Europe. Although the 1942 British Council tour to Sweden provided the impetus for *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, ideas on how nations "fertilized", developed sympathy for and mutual understanding of each other's cultures had germinated in the pages of *The Criterion*: the cultural proximity rule Eliot developed in *Notes* became not only a postulated formula for how

---

[276] *CPP*, 119-120.
[277] *CPP*, 121.

individuals and communities relate to and behave in relation to other cultures, but also a postulated practice for the public intellectual or cultural ambassador. For Edward Said, speaking nearly fifty years later, "exilic displacement" likewise emerges as an ideal vantage point for the public intellectual to the degree that the exile posture itself can be imagined. Where, as with Eliot, Said acknowledges the privileged potential of the exile "always to move away from the centralizing authorities towards the margins, where you see things that are usually lost on minds that have never traveled beyond the conventional and the comfortable," there is nevertheless a nuanced facet of Eliot's intellectual that Said's own account of the exile can illuminate. That is that, whilst for Said "it is still possible to think as [an expatriate], to imagine and investigate in spite of barriers", to inhabit the exilic role "even if one is not an actual immigrant or expatriate", Eliot's exile moves to the threshold of two adjacent cultures, enforcing an exilic move away from one's own culture not to glance backwards but to look beyond.[278] Said's and Eliot's conception of the imagined exilic posture collide because Said's imagined exile cannot, as Eliot's cultural observer must, imaginatively engage with one's own or another culture: if we cannot, as Eliot claims, be both outside and inside a culture, nor can we both be *imaginatively* inside and outside a culture. In short, according to Eliot's conception, we must self-exile ourselves from our culture in order to lean over the threshold into another, where the imaginative limits of our understanding of that other culture are imposed by the necessity to remain anchored to our own world.

The caution exercised in extending oneself beyond the threshold of one's cultural borders, however, is intimately tied up with Eliot's wariness of both wartime and post-War organised culture. This circumspection, however, did not remain a private concern, but often formed the foundation of his thinking about the transmission of culture during the British Council lectures themselves. Indeed, over a period of ten years, Eliot undertook a considerable number of engagements on behalf the British Council, including three foreign tours to Sweden (April 1942), Italy (December 1947) and Germany (October 1949), addresses to foreign institutes such as the Norwegian Institute in April 1943 (where he premiered one the earliest versions of "The Social Function of Poetry"), readings for French and Czechs in Edinburgh also in April 1943, an address on regionalism again to the Czechs in London in April

[278] Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual: the Reith Lectures* (New York: First Vintage Books, 1996), 62-3.

1945, in addition to three aborted tours to Iceland (May 1943), North Africa (May 1944), and Italy (May 1940). Although, as Eliot would write in the accompanying verse commentary to a 1941 MOMA exhibition on *Britain at War*, "we took up / our positions, in obedience to instructions", the struggle to reconcile a theory of an organic development of culture with this [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] pulsed through the *Notes* from its earliest drafts.[279] "Culture is the one thing we cannot deliberately aim at", he argues in the finished product: creating the conditions in which culture can flourish and regenerate cannot be "fulfilled solely by deliberate organisation." Yet it was the 1942 tour to Sweden which, as he told I. A. Richards in December of that year, prompted [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], alluding already to the first draft of that 1948 work. Eliot may have been uncertain, in the months subsequent to the Swedish lectures, of the efficacy of [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], but it was nevertheless [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[280]

Doubtful though Eliot may have been over the effectualness of his lectures, the political, economic and cultural results of that tour were considered immensely successful. Speaking on "Poetry, Speech and Music" and "Poetry in the Theatre", Eliot's lectures and readings garnered considerable press coverage, which both generated and affirmed the public interest in his criticism. Crucially, Eliot's visit also marked the reopening of the cultural exchange routes between Britain and Sweden.[281] Indeed, as *The Sunday Times* reported, there was not only widespread press support for such "cultural missions" undertaken by "British authorities", but an acknowledgement that such cultural diplomacy was central to the reinvigoration of the Anglo-Swedish book trade: "during the last two years three leading publishers in Stockholm have evolved a plan whereby they will periodically publish books in English. Before the war Sweden was one of the best export markets for good English

---

[279] T. S. Eliot to I. A. Richards, letter, December 7, 1942, I. A. Richards Papers, F/IAR/43, Magdalene College, Cambridge. Quoted by permission of the Master and Fellows.
[280] T. S. Eliot to Henry Ware Eliot, Jnr, letter, June 1, 1942, No. 115 Series III Miscellaneous Correspondence, T. S Eliot Papers, 1878-1958 (MS Am 1691), Houghton Library, Harvard University.
[281] The British Council, *Report of the British Council 1942-3* (London: British Council, 1943), 25.

books."[282] However, almost a year later in March 1943, and to mark the anniversary of that lecture tour, Eliot addressed the Anglo-Swedish Society in London on the very question of the ethics and efficacy of cultural warfare and propaganda. "[C]oncerned somewhat with the inevitable limitations of official activity" as well as the legitimate "limits of official activity", Eliot queried the necessity of war conditions to provide the impetus for cultural exchange between two nations.[283] Cultural relations between England and France, he reasoned, had continued throughout the Napoleonic wars, and historically the "reciprocal influence" between hostile nations had continued unabated during wartime, and it is with some suspicion that he questions why "war or, to put it more generally, international politics should make us more culture conscious and bring into being organisations for international relations for cultural communication".[284] Indeed, although he concedes that war itself could be culturally generative in terms of stimulating the synapses between countries, and that a degree of organized intervention is required to provide the economic infrastructure for this regeneration, Eliot is nevertheless wary of the emergence of a situation where culture is directed by political policy or theory.

Just as Eliot had, through *The Criterion*, attempted to reinvigorate the "cross-fertilisation" of culture between nations, it had, like any *deliberate* attempt to stimulate what he considered an organic process, disrupted the equilibrium of exchange: whilst *The Criterion* exposed a select number of British readers to the criticism and artistic developments on the continent – an elite communicating to an elite – the trade misbalance caused by economic sanctions resulted in an import surplus. Through *The Criterion* at least, the cultural imports from Europe far exceeded Britain's capacity to export, the ramifications of which became all too clear as European contributions declined as political tectonics shifted during the 1930s. As culture became "subordinated" to nationalist politics in Germany and Italy, so did the artistic discourse become introverted and solipsistic; it became "worse than silent – it became unintelligible".[285] Speaking only four years after the folding of *The Criterion*, Eliot once again invokes the economic analogy for cultural exchange based on a trade

[282] "Poet's Mission" *The Sunday Times* (April 26, 1942), 3.
[283] "The Nature of Cultural Relations" in *Friendship, Progress, Civilisation: Three War-time Speech to the Anglo-Swedish Society* (Holborn, London: Anglo-Swedish Society, 1943), 16.
[284] "The Nature of Cultural Relations", 16.
[285] "The Nature of Cultural Relations", 19.

equilibrium. A binary trade system, where one country exports more to another than it imports, can, he argues, be offset by the surplus imports from another country, thus sustaining a healthy ecology. Organized cultural exchange, however, artificially alters the natural osmosis that occurs between nations: "in no case should there be a deliberate attempt to supply a knowledge of British culture to another country without reciprocity; it is no good putting another people in a position to understand us better unless we are also going to make the effort to understand them".[286] Politically directed cultural programs had the tendency to cultivate a hegemonic system, when their mandate, according to Eliot, should be "to facilitate, to assist, rather than to direct, the cultural relations of nations".[287] It was individuals, rather than organizations, who were best suited to undertake cultural ambassadorial roles. More specifically, as he would later argue in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, cultural reciprocity and transmission was contingent not only an elite, but on an elite who understood the productivity of leisure.

According to Eliot's conception, the elite were comprised of "the ablest artists and architects", who could help govern the nation by "ris[ing] to the top, influenc[ing] taste, and execut[ing] the important public commissions". Convinced that "the ablest minds will find expression in speculative thought", Eliot railed against "the consultative councils, the standing committees, select committees / and sub-committees" of "Difficulties of a Statesman", who, though "shar[ing] a vocabulary and an idiom which appear to communicate every shade of meaning necessary for their common purpose", nevertheless compartmentalise this discourse, separating it from the business of everyday living.[288] The "common social convention, a common

---

[286] "The Nature of Cultural Relations", 17. Eliot was not the only member of his family in 1943 to be promoting the relationship between free trade and international stability. Thomas H. Eliot, the son of Charles W. Norton and the cousin of T. S. Eliot, speaking as the director of the Division of the American Office of War Information, gave a speech to the British Association for International Understanding on July 27, 1943, in which he argued against *economic* hegemony: "The furtherance of world trade, giving everybody a chance, rather than wiping out the other fellow, was more vital perhaps to lasting peace than any organization that might be set up, whether it was a world organization or a permanent alliance of three or four countries or of all the United Nations". Like his cousin, Thomas H. Eliot stressed the primacy of the individual in sustaining economic equilibrium, rather than the inflexible and politically charged leviathans. See "World Trade Vital to Peace" *The Times* (July 28, 1943), 2.

[287] "The Nature of Cultural Relations"; 20.

[288] *Notes*, 45; *CPP*, 129; *Notes*, 85.

ritual, and common pleasures of relaxation" which form the joints of a "circle of friends" become an essential mechanism for an elite, bound together by such commonalities, to develop and transmit ideas. Indeed, it is in the interstices between organised committee work and idle moments, in the leisured moments where the elite can "meet without merely talking shop or being at pains to talk each other's shop" when cultural transmission can occur.[289] This semi-conscious exchange is generative, argues Eliot at the end of the study, because culture itself is never "wholly conscious": it resists the planning or "artificially stimulated activities" of committees because culture itself behaves like a white noise: it directs and forms the "unconscious background of all our planning".[290]

Although, as Eliot would articulate it in the 1943 lecture, "[t]here is no substitute for the communication between person and person", organizations such as the British Council he considered "invaluable" in providing the infrastructure to support the exchange of "representatives".[291] The final paragraphs of *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* sees Eliot waver between a cautious acceptance of the necessity for such institutions and a resistance to "to accept as permanent or normal and healthy the conditions which make such direction necessary". It was not the business of an organization such as the British Council, moreover, to become a permanent substitute for the interpersonal communication between the intellectual elite, nor was it to make normative the reliance of public intellectuals upon centrally funded cultural organizations to make such communication possible: "[t]he alarming thing", wrote Eliot to Allen Tate in March 1945, "is that this sort of commission may be the only way in which a man of letters can ever get abroad from his own country".[292] Only through localised ventures could it be ensured that there would be a separation of "the central funds from control over their use", envisioning, here, a comparable governance structure to that of the BBC, whereby funds were derived from the legislature with a guarantee of autonomy from political direction.[293]

---

[289] *Notes*, 85.
[290] *Notes,* 94.
[291] "The Nature of Cultural Relations", 20; *Notes*, 94.
[292] TSE to Allen Tate, letter, 13 March, 1945, Allen Tate Papers, Box 26, Folder 35, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
[293] *Notes*, 94. In 1950, the question of how far national cultural institutes should be, and could be, independent of the governments who funded them was still contested. In a letter to *The Times* in July 1950, Eliot responded to a statement issued by the P.E.N. objecting to the closing of some foreign institutes on the basis "'it should be

"'Standing alone'" as Marina Mackay has argued, may have become the "master narrative for national isolation from the continent", but for intellectuals and authors such as Eliot, the desire to stand apart from centrally funded cultural institutions conflicted with the desire to promulgate, within these institutions, the notion of a European cultural unity, to work in fact to dispel the stand-alone, isolationist myth. If, as Mackay further asserts, modernists were "compelled to scrutinize the political and moral claims of insular nationality" through their literature, nowhere was this scrutiny most articulated and more forcefully exerted than in those politically-funded cultural institutions for which they lectured.[294]

Certainly Eliot was more at home and had greater confidence in the cultural vectors of the BBC, which, having been established for nearly twenty years by the War's outbreak, was equally confident of Eliot's ability to command the airwaves so as to communicate across national borders. Indeed, a memo from the Director General of the BBC from June 1941 testifies to the international intellectual authority Eliot had acquired as [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. He was, they considered, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], and who could be called upon in the precarious diplomatic dance taking place between the U.S. and Britain at the time to exert a targeted and concentrated influence on a [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. He was, however, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], in significant part because of his obligations to Faber and his numerous speaking engagements.[295] Elusive though Eliot might have been, any authority that Eliot ultimately wielded in his lectures for the British Council emanated out of his broadcasts for the BBC.

Yet Eliot's ambivalent position in relation to "export-culture" originated not only out of a troubling incompatibility with his theory of organicism: more

---

possible to devise ways of safeguarding national security without destroying the lines of cultural communication between one country and another'". Eliot's criticism of P.E.N. stemmed not from the objection itself, but from the lack of interrogation into *how* political acrimony can plausibly be isolated from a cultural mandate between nations. See Eliot's Letter to the Editor, "National Cultural Institutes", *The Times* (11 July, 1950); 5.

[294] Marina Mackay, *Modernism and World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 2.

[295] Director General to D. E. S., memo, June 30, 1941, Rcont 1. Eliot, T. S. Talks File 2, 1938-1943, BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

importantly, I would argue, it stemmed from a national resistance to, and even sceptical attitudes within, institutions such as the British Council. Since World War I, there had been an encultured resistance to organised cultural propaganda, and there was a reluctance by the Government, according to Mackay, to resurrect the anti-Hun invectives of the Beaverbrook era for fear of "being discredited as a warmonger of the Great War stripe".[296] Although cultural warfare dispersed more innocuously through the British Council would amount to a less direct assault, one directed outwards towards Europe rather than at the home front, one of the obstacles to setting up institutions such as the Alliance Française was the post-War connotation of deception and vulgarity attached to the word "propaganda", which had acquired a bitter taste.[297]

Suspicion of cultural institutionalism, as Stefan Collini's *Common Reading* demonstrates, was, however, largely an Anglocentric phenomenon. With the passing of the 1891 Chace Act, Collini argues, literary celebrity and the professionalization of authorship began to cohere, and British authors looked to cultural institutions such as the Académie Française as an example of "an officially sanctioned source of authority in literary matters" that was lacking in Britain at the time.[298] It is with some irony that the historical rhetoric of British cultural superiority was one of the principle factors in the dangerous delay for establishing a cultural institute in Britain. As Harold Nicholson put it in a 1955 anniversary report for the British Council, the mindset of officials was that "'[i]f foreigners failed to appreciate, or even to notice, our gifts of invention or our splendid adaptability, then there was nothing that we could do to mitigate their obtuseness. The genius of England, unlike that of lesser countries, spoke for itself'".[299]

In the years following World War I, as Eliot was establishing *The Criterion* as a vehicle for European cultural exchange, there was nevertheless a felt absence in the 1920s and early 1930s of cultural institutions that could promote British culture. Once

---

[296] Mackay, 11. Beaverbrook, however, would be instrumental in the heavy criticism that the British Council received in the years immediately after the War, with his *Express* group of newspapers carrying out a "vendetta against the British Council" based on the accusation that it was a waste of money and its administration uneconomical, even greedy. See Frances Donaldson, *The British Council: The First Fifty Years* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1984), 142-145.
[297] Frances Donaldson, *The British Council: The First Fifty Years* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1984); 13.
[298] Stefan Collini, *Common Reading: Critics, Historians, Publics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 243-5.
[299] Quoted in Donaldson, 11.

again, those concerned with Britain's cultural isolationism looked towards the Continent and saw state-sponsored cultural institutions emerging in Germany, Italy, the Soviet Union, and France. Indeed, the Alliance Française, which in 1933 was "by far the largest, best organized and most powerful instrument of propaganda", was funded by the French executive and was considered an integral diplomatic resource.[300] In the 1930s, Britain faced a diplomatic cultural crisis: as Germany, Italy and the Soviet Union bolstered their cultural ministries with massive state budgets in the war of ideas, Britain, despite having a formal cultural presence in Florence since 1917 with the establishment of a British Institute, staggered woefully behind in its understanding and acceptance of culture as a means of warfare.

It was, therefore, a begrudging acknowledgment of the need for a formal cultural institute that could "foster that interchange in the interests of peaceful and happy international relations…rightly to be regarded as a function of the prudent state".[301] In July 1935, the British Council was formed to counter the hostilities brewing in the lead-up to WWII, although faith, or lack thereof, in the efficacy and value of the Council's projected works was conveyed in its first budget – a mere six thousand pounds.[302] Despite starting on a restricted budget, the British Council set forth on a cultural programme that included successful theatre tours by the Old Vic and the establishment of the Lectures Committee chaired by the Poet Laureate John Masefield. Indeed, in the first two years of the Council's existence, the lectures department had commissioned a number of tours to most of the countries in Europe, calling early upon the services of such literary speakers as Rebecca West.[303] The Council's activities accelerated at the onset of the War, and, in order to increase the

---

[300] Donaldson, 3.
[301] The British Council, *Report of the British Council 1940-41* (London: British Council, 1941), 16.
[302] Donaldson, 28. If Eliot sought later to analogise the administration of the British Council with the BBC, it was not without reason. In the Council's formative years, there was an attempt to directly coordinate the British Council and the BBC, since, as Donaldson suggests, "[n]either the Foreign Office nor the British Council seemed at this date to have any conception of the national importance and great future of the BBC". Because, as one official saw it, both institutions were engaged in cultural propaganda, it was proposed, moreover, that the British Council procure some revenue from the BBC's own grant, a proposal which was swiftly put to bed. See Donaldson, 37.
[303] Donaldson, 62, 38. West, like Eliot, was severely critical, however, of the administrative capacity of the British Council. For an account by West of her own poorly organized trip to Austria, Yugoslavia and Greece see Donaldson, 38-39.

Council's profile and influence, not only were more British Institutes established abroad, but also new and existing Anglophile Societies were encouraged. Furthermore, the Council was central in aiding the formation of British schools abroad, furthering the knowledge of the English language and facilitating student exchanges. Cultural warfare, initially, stood pace with military action, and a whole arsenal of media was employed, including the press, films, literature, exhibition, lectures, concerts and theatre performances, to promote the work of the Council.[304] "In the first month of the year, April 1940," according to the 1940-41 *Report*, "the Council was still pursuing its European lecture programme", although by May conditions in Italy had deteriorated to the extent that Eliot's planned tour to the region in May was abruptly cancelled, and Osbert Sitwell found himself in a precarious position whilst on a lecture tour to Milan.[305]

Despite its centrality in the culture wars, the British Council was nevertheless sensitive to the hostility directed at any suggestion of aggressive propaganda. Instead, what the Council disseminated was "national interpretation, a happier phrase than cultural propaganda" and one which "implies the employment by the state to the national advantage of the whole cultural resources of the nation".[306] Unlike Nazi propaganda, "the fanatical propagation of a gospel fanatically held", which in its religiosity was designed to "overawe where it cannot convert", the Council envisioned its practice as both descriptive and didactic, contingent on an holistic, if not packaged, understanding of heritage and an authoritative, authentic historical narrative. In employing the "cultural resources" of the nation, where artistic and scientific knowledge was considered a "resource", the Council sought to present "that intangible but powerful force, the national personality". Indeed, it was the Council's "task" to "to paint a picture both of the past and the present, drawn fairly with an impartial hand which neglects no aspect of Britain and gives to the whole, so far as skill permits, the interpretation of the Englishman of the present day".[307] Representative, descriptive, interpretative, but impartial, the British Council attempted to maintain, despite pressure from the Foreign Office, its political neutrality by fostering an understanding of the nation's organic historical development to

---

[304] The British Council, *Report of the British Council 1940-41* (London: British Council, 1941), 22.
[305] *Report of the British Council 1940-41*, 115.
[306] *Report of the British Council 1940-41*, 16.
[307] *Report of the British Council 1940-41*, 18, 16.

rationalize its cultural and political present, developing an historical profile of its "personality", rather than promulgating a theory or doctrine of political behaviour.

It is unsurprising, then, that one of Eliot's first lectures for the British Council, originally intended for the May 1940 tour of Italy, should be an historical account of the development of English poetry entitled "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry. Types of English Religious Verse".[308] This lecture formed the groundwork for much of Eliot's published criticism on drama and versification of the 1940s, criticism that became a major component of his later British Council tours. Clearly the timing was propitious, for the lectures provided Eliot with an international platform on which not only to foreground his criticism, but also to promote the plays, especially *Murder in the Cathedral* and *The Family Reunion*, which realised the conceptual understanding of prosody and the vernacular that permeated such dramatic criticism.[309]

Recasting these lectures in the context of the British Council, for which a great deal of Eliot's drama criticism was originally composed, illuminates the extent to which Eliot considered the renovation of poetic language along the lines of ordinary speech as not only culturally restorative, but which could also generated a language that reflected the concerns of a *European* audience fractured by the old language of old wars. Theatre was, the British Council found, a very effective means of unifying an audience through a recognizable idiom, explaining the popularity of the performances organized by the Old Vic on behalf of the Council, as well as the level of investment that went into the 1947 4,600 mile tour by the Old Vic Theatre Company from Perth to New Zealand, led by Laurence Olivier and Vivien Leigh.[310] As Eliot explained some ten years before the onset of World War II, "[f]ew things that can happen to a nation are more important than the invention of a new form of verse", for it confirms the continuing vitality of a nation and its culture, a new

---

[308] Eliot, "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry. Types of English Religious Verse. Drafts for cancelled lectures in Italy British Council, 1939", T. S. Eliot Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses [c. 1930] – 1955, H1. HB Quarto 1, Hayward Bequest, Kings College, Cambridge.

[309] Requests for translation and performance rights, as Eliot's letters in the Hayward Bequest demonstrate, were plentiful in the War years. Indeed, the British Council occasionally arbitrated between Eliot and the Société des Auteurs in France to recover the royalties for performances.

[310] Donaldson, 157. As an indication of just how successful the Australian-New Zealand tour was, the takings were over £160,000, with a profit of £40,000.

prosody a sign of linguistic renewal and an artistic elite alert to the developments in a civilization discursively mediated.[311]

Anxious though Eliot was to avoid political polemic in the Council lectures, any suggestion of the tired "wisdom of old men" of *East Coker,* who Mackay identifies as the "elderly pro-appeasement Tories and accomplices being savaged in the contemporary press", finds its correlative in his discussion of the life-cycle of language.[312] "Had they deceived us, / Or deceived themselves," asks Eliot of "the quiet-voiced elders, / Bequeathing us merely a receipt for deceit?".[313] The tired rhetoric of failed diplomacy marches out of step with the impulse for re-evaluation, when "every moment is a new and shocking / Valuation of all we have been".[314] If, for Mackay, Eliot "anchors modernist effort solidly to the experience of war" told discursively through *Four Quartets*, concluding that modernism's final moments are regenerative, his British Council lectures show most demonstratively that a discussion of the need for a prosody of the vernacular is not a vehicle for the discussion of an archaic wartime rhetoric of which "We are only undeceived / Of that which, deceiving, could no longer harm": it is the same discussion.[315] The death of a civilization is the corollary of the death of a language, the symptom of which, he suggests in the draft lecture script, "is when men go on writing poetry in a style and vocabulary which has become meaningless to their less learned contemporaries".[316] Even polemic, when dispersed through an antiquated version of a language, becomes ineffectual.

The focus of Eliot's lecture, then, is on the organic life-cycle of poetry and language. The War coincided with what Eliot considered to be another period of linguistic and poetic renewal stimulated by the natural cycle of innovation and degeneration, in itself a symptom of a developed and continuously developing civilization. In his history of this "pattern", Eliot cites Spenser as the progenitor of the verse form inherited by Shakespeare and Marlowe who, though superior versifiers, were nevertheless derivative. There is a difference, he suggests, between those who

---

[311] Eliot, "Introduction" in *Seneca. His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English*, vol. 1, ed. Thomas Newton (London: Constable and Co. Ltd.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927). xlix-l.
[312] Mackay, 74.
[313] *CPP*, 179.
[314] *CPP*, 179.
[315] *CPP*, 179.
[316] Eliot, "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry".

derive, or imitate, and those like Dryden and Donne who innovate. Donne and Dryden could innovate because the source of their prosody and verse was the spoken language, although this poetic idiom was necessarily accompanied by a comparatively short half-life: developments in the vernacular follow a generational trajectory, meaning that the verse of these two poets inevitably becomes outmoded. It was at such a point in the oscillation of the language that Eliot found the condition of poetry to be in 1940, the decline prompting the poets of the day to attempt to devise a prosodic idiom which could "conform" to the way that the language was being spoken.[317]

The deference is important here: composed perhaps by an artistic elite, poetry is not in itself an elitist form. Poetry instead needed to be embroidered into the discursive fabric of the everyday, to be representative not only idiomatically but in a vernacular which could carry [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[318] Indeed, one of his criticisms of early modernism – what he refers to more specifically as Imagism – was exactly this level of detachment from the vernacular, where the impulse towards producing an experientially totalising metaphor demanded a [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]that insisted on the divorce from a spoken idiom, and which "[This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[319] "Since our concern was speech, and speech impelled us / To purify the dialect of the tribe", writes Eliot in *Little Gidding*: yet the process of purification desiccates the original linguistic compound, where, only through oxidization – "unless restored by that refining fire / Where you must move in measure, like a dancer" – can it recover the vernacular rhythms of the original.[320]

The arguments set forth in this first of the British Council lectures regarding the need to return to poetry a prosody [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] and to dismantle what Eliot considered to be the [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], become further refined in the subsequent Council lectures, and the rationale more

---

[317] Eliot, "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry".
[318] Eliot, "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry".
[319] Eliot, "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry".
[320] *CPP*, 194-5.

transparent.[321] For Marina Mackay, World War II was, or has been perceived to be, essentially a "civilian war", a "conflict in which the civilian experience was paramount", and which necessarily demands a reassessment of what constitutes war literature to "include texts that are not 'about' war in any straightforwardly mimetic way".[322] Mackay's account clearly encompasses the fiction and poetry of that War, but it is a useful and relevant framework for thinking about how Eliot's criticism written specifically for the British Council was itself engaged in a discussion of (cultural) combat, where the cycle of linguistic deterioration and regeneration has its correlative in a war of frontiers.

"The Music of Poetry", delivered at Glasgow University in February 1942 and very likely recycled in Sweden in May as "Poetry, Speech, and Music", inherited the basic formula of the undelivered lecture, and what originally began a statement of necessity evolved into "the law that poetry must not stray too far from the ordinary everyday language which we use and hear".[323] The correlative, however, is more forcefully articulated in "The Social Function of Poetry", delivered as "Le Rôle social des poètes" in France on behalf of the British Council in May 1945. Speaking at the War's end, Eliot puts forward a theory of poetry closely bound up in a rhetoric of civic responsibility. Only the previous month, the Labour party had issued its election manifesto, *Let Us Face the Future*, in which it had set out plans for the nationalization of key industries, including the energy, transport, and steel and iron industries, in a bid not only to quell the level of profiteering witnessed in the wake of World War I, but also to ensure that the priorities of such industry were in accordance with the interests of the nation. A similar policy is set forth by Eliot in his assessment of poetry as essentially a public utility, one subject to public ownership: "every people should have its own poetry", he asserts, acknowledging that poetry isn't a utility universally accessed. Poetry "makes a difference to the society as a whole, and that means to people who do not enjoy poetry" because it operates subcutaneously at a level sometimes unperceived by those not sensitive to its rhythms.[324] Like any primary or secondary industry, the operations of which are barely detectable in, or interfere with,

---

[321] Eliot, "The Last Twenty-Five Years of English Poetry".
[322] Mackay, 6.
[323] T. S. Eliot, "The Music of Poetry," in *On Poetry and Poets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957), 29.
[324] T. S. Eliot, "The Social Function of Poetry," in *On Poetry and Poets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957), 18.

the rhythms of everyday life, poetry, too, works covertly to "preserve" and "resort" a language, but also, importantly, for "it to develop, to be just as subtle and precise in the more complicated conditions and for the changing purposes of modern life, as it was in and for a simpler age".[325] If the nationalization of industry, for Labour, was predicated on the need to re-establish a strong export economy, Eliot's theory of poetry as a public holding operated on similar lines. For nationalization confers authority and responsibility for the flourishing of an industry – of a language, in this case – upon the whole nation, with very high stakes. The "people" are collectively responsible for the continuing "produc[tion]" of "great authors, and especially great poets", without whose skills to restore and develop language the national culture lies exposed to subsumption by a "stronger one": the ability of these poets to continuously develop and strengthen the language was the vital defence system on the cultural frontier.

Speaking at the end of a War fought aggressively on platforms of cultural hegemony and dominance throughout Europe, such presentiments were far from hyperbole. Still extant for Eliot is the conviction that language and culture not only operate on the same principles as, but are also materially contingent upon, the trade links between European nations, and of course his 1942 Swedish tour for the British Council coincided with the reopening of the publishing trade routes between Sweden and Britain. Indeed, this was marked by the publication of a volume of Eliot's poetry translated by Swedish poets – *Dikter I Urval* – , which increased his notoriety and the popularity of the lectures. With rising prices of paper and the imposition of export restrictions on books, translations were a vital force in mitigating the effects of the breakdown of the cultural trade routes between European nations. Although Eliot sanctioned some of these translations, including Henri Fluchère's 1942 French translation of *Murder in the Cathedral*, this was not, however, always a palatable remedy, with a number of unauthorized translations appearing of Eliot's work, as enforcing the Berne Convention became less of a priority during wartime, exposing many authors to a sort of literary looting.[326] Some of these translations were authorized by the British Council, and between 1945 and 1946 the Council sent "300

[325] "The Social Function of Poetry", 22-3.
[326] In Eliot's case, there were, for example, unauthorized translations of *Little Gidding* into Swedish in 1945, and of *Murder in the Cathedral* by Ludovici in 1940 in an edition published by Edizione Universitaria.

copies of representative modern British plays" to institutions abroad. "Of these, a considerable percentage were translated and produced with success", but not always with the author's consent, despite the Council's assertion that it arranged contracts between authors and the producers abroad.[327]

Yet one of the most effective means of overcoming the practical and ideological barriers to cultural trade during the War was the production of drama, with Eliot's *Murder* even being performed in Rome at Ill Teatro in 1940 and in occupied Denmark (Copenhagen) in 1944. Appreciating not only just how integral a means theatre was on the Continent to the rhetoric of cultural dominance and superiority, but also the remarkable degree to which it collapsed traditional class structures in England's cultural hemisphere, is vital if we are to understand the transition in Eliot's Council criticism towards the end of the War from prosody in poetry to a vernacular form of prosody specifically in poetic drama.

Both structurally and socially, the theatre underwent significant changes with the onset of the War. As the so-called "European theatre of war" raged in the skies and continued to expand its sphere, the London theatre scene found itself contracting and eventually closed for business as a result of heavy bombing. Despite many theatres being damaged, some were reopened in 1942, although they were, to all intents and purposes, quite different theatres. Having once been the cultural territory only of the wealthy, theatre managers found themselves having to cater to a quite different clientele with, as Dennis Kennedy explains, "the repertoire…often drastically altered to accommodate the large numbers of soldiers on leave in the capital looking for light entertainment".[328] Playwrights such as J. B. Priestly gravitated towards, and flourished among, this new demographic, where the querying of class structures and assumptions of class-based morality was not only acceptable but welcomed when couched in a recognizable vernacular. As *The Times*'s Dramatic

---

[327] The British Council, *The British Council: Report for 1945-1946* (London: The British Council, 1946), 118. In The Council's *Report for 1943-4*, it credits its part as an "intermediary in the disposal of translation rights" with "keep[ing] British writing before the foreign reader at a time when normal contacts between British and foreign authors, publishers and literary agents, though easier than they were, are still difficult enough". See *The British Council: Report for 1943-1944* (London: The British Council, 1944), 100.

[328] Dennis Kennedy, "British theatre, 1895-1946: art, entertainment, audiences – an introduction," in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre,* ed. Baz Kershaw (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 32.

Critic explained in 1953, gone was the respect for "the chromium-plated drama fashionable between the wars", with a new, younger, and more socially militant audience "open-eyed to the ideas of the time than were any of these theatres" ushered in. The "new audience which came into being during the war" demanded, "to the surprise of cynics, not the frivolous trash hitherto regarded as inevitable in war-time but anything that was theatrically good in its kind".[329]

Certainly, by 1950, when Eliot delivered the published version of *Poetry and Drama* at Harvard, he was very much alert to the new pressures upon playwrights issued by a new demographic of theatregoers who, having been generationally and materially detached from his earlier work, were immune, even apathetic to, his reputation as a poet.[330] Yet another "new law" appeared as a result: "that of dramatic relevance".[331] This transition was accompanied by some anxiety: concerns about the expansion of the acting pool, thanks to the regional repertory programmes which had sprung up during the War, became bound up in a formal concern that he had to write verse for actors rather than his own voice, and "you do not know whose voices they will be". In 1950, no longer could a playwright assume that the most important production of his play would be undertaken by actors vocally trained in the pre-War schools of theatre; even nuances of dialects were a possibility, and could potentially affect the rhythm of the verse. In the theatre, "the problem of communication presents itself immediately", and the charge of elitism with which Eliot is so often accused, particularly in terms of his being divorced from the realities of working- and lower-middle class life, come to the fore in the necessity of having to "write lines which will have an immediate effect upon an unknown and unprepared audience". Where the social status and educational background of an audience could, pre-War, have been largely assumed and guaranteed by a playwright, this new social mixture placed on the playwright such as Eliot a demand for a "common" idiom which, with the Alberts and Lils aside, he was unfamiliar.[332]

Such war-time playwrights as Priestly, however, were inevitably targeting a newly-mobile – both in terms of class and economics – working class, and this was reflected in the social habits of the theatre, with curtain times changed to

---

[329] "The Post-War Theatre" *The Times*, March 14, 1953.
[330] An earlier version of this lecture had been delivered on a British Council tour to Italy in 1947, and published as "La poesia nel teatro" in *La Fiera Letteraria*.
[331] Eliot, *Poetry and Drama* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), 24.
[332] Eliot, *Poetry and Drama*, 24.

accommodate working spectators, and evening dress, "abandoned as a wartime measure, never returned".[333] Yet one of the most important developments to have arisen out of the closure of the theatres was the rise in the number of repertory companies setting up outside of the capital. Many of the theatre companies evacuated out of the city towards what the theatre historian Andrew Davies calls "the provinces", although many of these companies took refuge in the cosmopolitan cities of The North.[334] The Old Vic, for example, moved its headquarters to Burnley in Lancashire and set up a permanent repertory company at the Liverpool Playhouse, and the BBC moved its Drama Department to Manchester, establishing its own specialist radio repertory company.[335] Access to a different clientele and a closer proximity to the audience – quite literally, at times, because of the differences in stage design – brought changes not only in the programme, but also in the way that theatres and actors engaged with their audience, lending a new lease of life to, and a refreshed perception of, the function of the theatre.

The regenerative potential of this theatrical exile was first experienced in the 1930s when the BBC began to supplement its National Programme with drama productions from the Regional services. Of the most "innovative" and the most popular, argues Keith Williams, was the Northern, based in Manchester, which offered "radical literary possibilities" in part because "[i]ts largely working-class audience affected the character of Manchester's broadcasting, which reflected the identity and accents of the region".[336] Theatrical repertory companies, likewise, found inspiration in the regions, and in the early years of the War the Old Vic "embarked upon a series of tours, deliberately visiting places ignored by the commercial drama".[337] That these tours changed the dynamic between the actors and the audience was brought about by the necessity of circumstance, but it was an altered relationship that even the most established of actors and actresses enthusiastically welcomed. In a 1940 Old Vic tour to South Wales, for example, the cast had to adapt to a pared-down production of *Macbeth*: but the "down-to-earth and unpompous character of setting

---

[333] Kennedy, 32.
[334] Andrew Davies, "The War Years," in *Theatre and War 1933-1945: Performance in Extremis*, ed. Michael Balfour (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001), 55.
[335] Davies; 57; Claire Cochrane, *Twentieth-Century British Theatre: Industry, Art and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 102.
[336] Keith Williams*, British Writers and the Media 1930-45* (Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1996), 34.
[337] Davies, 57.

and performances" were highly successful, and the *grande dame* of theatre, Sybil Thorndike, relished the eradication of the proscenium arch which allowed for "getting right in amongst people. Afterwards", she enthused, "they all come round and talk to us".[338]

Theatre tours by those companies such as the Old Vic were immensely popular, but they were by no means the only access to theatrical culture available to the regions. As Davies elucidates, small repertory companies were cropping up all over the country and were attracting sizeable audiences. Indeed, the Birmingham Rep was an example, suggests Davies, of a company which, in 1942, attracted a crowd of 35,000, even when the performance was forced to migrate to the city park when the Rep's theatre was bombed.[339] These performances, which brought audiences not only closer physically and empathetically to the actors but also to each other, motivated a change in the content and idiom of new plays. This example, moreover, provides a helpful analogy for the ways in the theatre space and the theatrical content evolved in tandem. Forced quite literally out of the traditional theatre hall and into a shared, classless public space, prompted playwrights, in Eliot's words, to "bring poetry into the world in which the audience lives and to which it returns when it leaves the theatre".[340] The proscenium arch may have been dismantled temporarily, or its foundations weakened in the long term, but the theatre doors were to be taken off their hinges. For verse to be seen as a normative idiom in drama, audiences had to be left unmolested by the transitional archways of a theatre: they were not to enter "some imaginary world totally unlike their own, an unreal world in which poetry can be spoken".[341] Eliot perceived a relationship between space and aurality, where speech behaviour, and our expectations of how one should speak, changes according to the environment through which one passes. The most efficient way of making normative a prosody of the vernacular, Eliot realised, was to integrate it into the material conditions of everyday life of those who are "dressed like ourselves" and who own "telephones and motor cars and radio sets", material goods of communication and movement which demand a form of linguistic passing between idioms. Far from Sweeney's Cannibal Isle where these material goods are forsaken, the verse play

[338] Thorndike quoted in Davies, 57.
[339] Davies, 62.
[340] Eliot, *Poetry and Drama,* 31.
[341] Eliot, *Poetry and Drama*, 31.

becomes a commodity that can form a share of a domestic economy, where its idiom becomes integrated into a domestic system of linguistic passing. The economic enfranchisement of the theatre and its audience during the War, which introduced a significantly wider demographic to this cultural market, permitted its assimilation into the economy of the "sordid, dreary, daily world", a world "suddenly illuminated and transfigured" by poetry.[342]

Where, for Eliot, a colloquial idiom infused by "dramatic relevance" was a reactionary theory to the social developments in the theatre culture that had taken place during the War, for Mussolini, the concept that the theatre needed to be intelligible and relevant to the masses was a principle of national concern. As early as 1933, Mussolini had identified a crisis in theatre culture in Italy, with access restricted to a small section of the population. In order to effectively democratize the theatre, Mussolini not only declared plans to build theatres which could accommodate as many as 20,000 people, but institute a repertoire that could "'stir great collective passions and must be imbued with a sense of vivid and deep humanity. It has to present matters that truly count in people's spiritual life and that reflect their aspirations'".[343] Behind Mussolini's impulse towards a "collective" theatre was a political objective that was lacking in in the similar assertion made by Eliot. But as Eliot made his strongest case yet for a representative rhythm in *dramatic* prosody in 1949 with *The Aims of Poetic Drama*, a lecture delivered in Hamburg for the British Council, he was doing so with a post-War Labour-initiated programme of establishing a National Theatre and the Arts Council of Great Britain in the hinterland. In comparison, both Italy and Germany had had centrally funded theatres since the early 1930s, with the Fascist regimes seeking to capitalize on the art form as a means of asserting cultural dominance and disseminating nationalist agendas. In Italy, however, this had had a surprisingly diluted effect, for although Mussolini's regime strongly endorsed the theatre, there was a determined resistance to staging Fascist propaganda.[344]

---

[342] *Poetry and Drama*, 31

[343] Pietro Cavallo "Theatre Politics of the Mussolini Regime and their Influence on Fascist Drama," in *Theatre and War 1933-1945: Performance in Extremis,* ed. Michael Balfour, trans. Erminia Passannanti and Günter Berghaus (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001), 22.

[344] Cavallo, 22.

Hitler, on the other hand, engaged much more aggressively than Italy in "purging" German theatres, which were, according to Strobl, "the first part of German culture to undergo thorough nazification".[345] Indeed, the Minister of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels, sought to claim the theatre as an innately German art form, which "'had found in German culture its deepest and truest expression'", nationalizing the theatre in both sense of that word.[346] The Nazis went on to make one of the largest theatre industries in Europe, pre-empting Britain in identifying the influence of the regions by establishing local resident companies. Between 1933 and 1940, "the theatre sector had grown from 147 resident companies to 248" as a result of large-scale state investment. The advent of the War by no means saw this trend abating, and in 1942, when the majority of London's theatres had evacuated, Germany had 362 operational theatre buildings. So vital to the cause of German cultural primacy was the theatre, that a significant number of peripatetic theatre repertories were established, many of which conveyed drama's "truest expression" in German regional dialects and "so-called peasant theatres specialising in rural comedies". The sheer scale of investment in the theatre has led Strobl to conclude that "the Nazis were justified in claiming that no country at any time in history had even remotely offered a similarly rich theatre provision".[347] Indeed, a history of state neglect and indifference to the theatre in Britain fuelled German propaganda narratives of a country neither respectful of nor interested in the development of its culture, one which was left to decay whilst Germany's art culture sprang to life, was regenerated by, a National Socialism programme.[348]

Given the disparity of investment in theatrical institutions during the War in Britain in comparison to the state programmes erected in Russia, Italy and Germany, it is perhaps hardly surprising that, on its election, the new Labour government should have reversed the policy "of benign neglect for a cultural institution that appealed to only a small segment of the population" in favour of a state-sponsored theatre. The nationalization of other state industries and the creation of a welfare state brought the cultural health of the nation, as a priority, into alignment with this socialist agenda, one that stressed a continual investment in the holistic development of an

---

[345] Gerwin Strobl, *The Swastika and the Stage: German Theatre and Society, 1933-1945* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 3.
[346] Goebbels quoted in Strobl, 210.
[347] Strobl, 197.
[348] Stroble, 210.

individual.[349] For the British Council, however, the large-scale cultural programmes of Germany and Italy during the War had put Britain on the back foot, but the neglect of cultural institutions in the allied countries and the destruction of these enemy programmes at the end of the War had left a far more dangerous void. Politically dangerous cells, Europe had learnt, frequently gestated in chaos and particularly in poverty, and in France, in the immediate aftermath of the War, there was a significant degree of discontent regarding the ineffectiveness of the 1944 Charter of the French Resistant Council (CNR), which had promised social reform. "Little had happened to alter the basically inegalitarian character of French society or to enlarge the small circle of key decision makers", explains Roger Price, whilst poverty and food shortages were popularly attributed to "speculators and the greed of the rich".[350]

A more pressing concern, however, was the presence of a Communist influence in France, which flourished in the first phase of the Fourth Republic: the *tripartisme*. This was a political alliance of Socialists, Communists and Christian Democrats which lasted until 1947, the French Communist Party (PCF) so successful that in 1946,

> with 800,000 mainly working-class members, the PCF was the largest political party, well organised, with an effective propaganda machine, the sympathy of influential artists and intellectuals such as Pablo Picasso and Jean-Paul Sartre and a predominating influence within the trade unions, its sense of identity nowhere more evident than at the annual Fête de l'Humanité.[351]

It is unsurprising, then, that in May 1945 Eliot was in Paris for the British Council delivering "The Social Function of Poetry", which, though perhaps unintentional, rerouted potentially incendiary notions of an elite out of touch with the privations of the populace, by positing an egalitarian relationship between emotion and language:

> Emotion and feeling, then are best expressed in the common language of the people – that is, in the language common to all classes: the structure, the rhythm, the sound, the idiom of a language, express the personality of the people which speaks it.[352]

---

[349] Kennedy, 33.
[350] Roger Price, *A Concise History of France*, 3rd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 331.
[351] Price, 345.
[352] Eliot, "The Social Function of Poetry", 19.

Although Eliot's lecture remains apolitical, instructing a French audience in the unsettled spring of 1945 to redirect "emotion and feeling" not only away from the provocative rhetoric of the competing political parties into an egalitarian idiom ("common to all classes"), but also imaginatively rechanneling the experience of that emotion through a poetic idiom of the vernacular, s conveyed a methodology by which to defuse social tensions.

The following month, Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* began a run at the Vieux Colombier theatre from a translation by Fluchère, whilst the British Council were quick to initiate an exchange between the Old Vic and the Comédie Française in the same month. If, as Eliot had argued two years earlier at the Anglo-Swedish Institute, "every country needs to import as well as to export…in order to maintain and to develop its own" culture, the British Council was deploying some heavy-duty fertilizer.[353] Indeed, The Old Vic Company was directed by Laurence Olivier and included some of Britain's most valued actors, including Sybil Thorndike and Ralph Richardson. For the first time in its history, the Théâtre Français hosted a foreign company, staging *Richard III*, *Peer Gynt*, and *Arms and the Man*, and between 1945 and 1946, reported the British Council, "interest in British Drama abroad was increasingly shown, especially in the liberated countries".[354]

In the immediate aftermath of the War, the British Council clearly saw itself charged with a mandate to provide both reparative aid and direction to European cultures. Confident that Britain's own cultural development had continued unabated, "the isolation or suspension of cultural activities in most European countries during the war" gave it a conscionable remit to "bridge the gap in cultural…developments". Moreover, in the *Report for 1946-1947*, the Council openly declared that remit which would correct, or reroute, errant currents of thought, which had "in the past to lead to the subjugation of education and culture to political tyranny". The *Report* goes on:

---

[353] "The Nature of Cultural Relations", 17.

[354] The British Council, *The British Council: Report for 1945-1946* (London: The British Council, 1946), 117-118. The theatre producer and critic Ashley Dukes, who had produced Eliot's earlier commercial plays, reported in *The Observer* in December 1944 on the continuing theatre scene in Paris. The article outlines concerted efforts to show that the theatre was prevailing despite problems in infrastructure, the flourishing of a cultural community in France vital to wartime morale, cementing the link between civilization and cultural generation. See "Theatre in Paris" *The Observer*, December 10, 1944.

> There are many indications that Britain has a unique opportunity of assuming and holding a position of moral and cultural leadership in the world as marked and at least as honourable as that which she formerly occupied in finance and industry.[355]

With the Empire now in ruins and the economy severely weakened, the Council sought instead to capitalise on Britain's cultural history – thought to be untouched by the lame economy – as well as the oft-touted moral imperative for War, which had been the sustained rhetoric throughout. With the loss of a material Empire, the Council, with the residue of an imperial mentality, attempted instead to extend its cultural and intellectual reach.

Whether or not the narrative employed by the British Council was entirely in touch with reality, its ability to fulfil its self-styled mandate couldn't be questioned. From a mere 20 lecture tours taking place between 1944 and 1945, this figure had nearly quadrupled in the 1945/6 year to 77 tours, 107 in 1946/7, 122 in 1947/8, and finally an astonishing 151 in 1948/9.[356] Whilst the Council would pay for the expenses of the tour it could not offer lecturers a fee, and it is testimony to the faith in and conviction of the Council's mandate that it could rely on the good will of its most distinguished speakers. Lecturers came from a variety of specialist backgrounds, and although between 1948 and 1949 the demand from the Continent was largely for scientific and technical knowledge, literature comprised 21% of the total lectures, and drama a significant minority of 7%.[357] The subject analysis, however, belies the importance attached to certain speakers, and the securement of Eliot was frequently considered a coup. Eliot's international reputation, at this point, was cemented by his radio broadcasts to Rome in 1944 following its liberation, and to Germany in 1945. Despite the fact that scholarship has been largely dismissive of Eliot's drama, it was, however, his plays which confirmed his international appeal as a speaker: a new translation of *Murder in the Cathedral* was published and performed in Pisa to "thousands of spectators" in August 1948; the same play had been translated, in 1946,

---

[355] The British Council, *The British Council: Report for 1946-1947* (London: The British Council, 1947), 11.
[356] The British Council, *The British Council: Report for 1948-1949* (London: The British Council, 1949), 20.
[357] British Council. *The British Council: Report for 1948-1949* (London: The British Council, 1949), 20.

into German by Rudolf Alexander Schröder, who later published a translation of *The Family Reunion* in 1949, coinciding with Eliot's Council visit to Hamburg.[358]

"Does *Four Quartets* have a politics?", asks Marina Mackay of Eliot's wartime poem, with convincing affirmation.[359] Such a question, however, requires modification for Eliot's lectures, anxious as the British Council was to defend itself against charges of disseminating propaganda and conscious as Eliot was that men of letters across Europe held the "common responsibility…to preserve our common culture uncontaminated by political influences".[360] In a new era of cultural warfare and cultural relations, in "A Note on Culture and Politics" he reminds us that politics operates as much *within* a culture as a culture does within politics.[361] Indeed, where organisations such as the British Council, Eliot explained, were "invaluable" to the continuing contact between national cultures in a period of reconstruction, the continuing growth of culture relies on individual contact.[362] It was not sustainable for this contact to be mediated through institutions governed by a political theory "less concerned with human nature" and which "tends…to form minds which will be set to think only in terms of impersonal and inhuman forces". With a political theory less concerned "with men rather than masses, and with the human passions of individuals rather than with those vast impersonal forces which in our modern society are a necessary convenience of thought", literature – and drama in particular – refocus and localise *language* "contaminated by political influences".[363]

Rather than questioning whether Eliot's lectures had a politics, we might consider the extent to which Eliot sought to rehabilitate poetry and verse drama into a localised rather than national concern, redirecting focus away from a rhetoric aimed at the masses towards an idiom concerned with the experience of the individual. Indeed, directing our own attention to the contextual origins of these lectures on verse drama and poetry show Eliot to be, at the very least, alert to the political circumstances that necessitated the need for such lectures in the first place.

---

[358] "Italians see 'Murder in the Cathedral'" *The Manchester Guardian*, August 26, 1948.
[359] Mackay; 73.
[360] "The Unity of European Culture" in *Notes*, 123.
[361] *Notes*, 83.
[362] *Notes*, 94.
[363] *Notes*, 88.

2.1 The British Council Lectures in Italy

When Eliot was invited by the Rome representative of the British Council, Ronald Bottrall, to speak in Italy in 1947, it was with the understanding that this tour would follow on the heels of another invitation to speak in Marseilles and Aix, where he was to receive a doctorate from the University of Aix-en-Provence. On September 25, 1947, Bottrall, who had been appointed the Rome Representative in April 1945, wrote to the Lectures Department of the Council mooting the idea of the Council's financing Eliot's plane fare from Marseilles to Rome.[364] [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[365] The significance of securing Eliot as a valued lecturer is suggested, too, in the flurry of correspondence which was quickly exchanged within the organization. By October 3, an official "Request for Approval for a Proposed Lecture Tour" had already been issued from the Director of the Lectures Department, reiterating Bottrall's assessment of Eliot and requesting the funds to pay for Eliot's airfare – fifty pounds – between Marseilles and Rome.[366] A letter from J. D. Argles of the Lectures Department was dispatched to Eliot on the same date to clarify the details, but by October 7 Eliot had written back to correct an important misunderstanding. Argles had been led to believe by Bottrall that Eliot had already been invited to speak in Italy by the *Fiera Letteraria* in Rome and another cultural institute in Florence, both of which, it was understood, would fund the majority of Eliot's trip. Eliot's letter, however, stressed the contrary, having consented to the lecture tour on the basis that the Council would bear the entirety of the expense.[367] This organizational and bureaucratic minutiae may appear as a trifling interlude in the history of Eliot's relationship with the Council. Yet given the fact that

---

[364] Bottrall had been the Sweden Representative when Eliot lectured there, but was also a lecturer in his own right. In the Autumn of 1947, Bottrall visited Greece to lecture in Athens on "Virginia Woolf" and "Joseph Conrad", and was evidently committed to the value and influence of British Modernism as an established literary epoch to be promoted under the institutional auspices of the British Council. See "News from Home and Overseas" *The Monthly Review of the British Council* (December, 1947), 216.

[365] Ronald Bottrall to Lectures Department of the British Council, letter, September 25, 1947, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours, 1945-1948", BW83/3. The National Archives, Kew.

[366] Director, Lectures Department, memo, "Request for Approval for a Proposed Lecture Tour", October 3, 1947, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours, 1945-1948", BW83/3, The National Archives, Kew.

[367] Letter from Eliot to J. D. Argles, October 7, 1947. "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours, 1945-1948". BW83/3. The National Archives, Kew.

the British Council was undergoing severe budget cuts during this financial year, the corrective measures taken to ensure the tour could proceed speak to the value they attached to Eliot as a cultural ambassador. A memo dated October 9 from E. Noël Paton, the Acting Director of the Lectures Department, to the Budget Department revealed the Council considered Eliot's tour [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], requesting a further thirty pounds to fully finance the tour.[368] This brought the total budget to eighty pounds – nearly three thousand pounds in today's money – with the representative in Rome consenting to the extra financial burden: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[369]

Eliot, it was agreed, was to give an address in Aix-en-Provence on December 6 before flying on from Marseilles to Rome on December 8. Yet the political tectonics on the Continent, the effects of which the Council lectures were designed in part to mitigate, would prove to severely disrupt this plan. In November, the Mouvement Républicain Populaire (MRP) took control of the government in France following the dissolution of an unstable coalition. Since February, the U.S. had expressed anxiety over the presence of a Communist faction in the coalition, and the programme of financial aid introduced in France as part of the Marshall Plan was designed to offer an economic vaccine against unemployment and rising inflation, the petri dish in which Communism and Communist-inspired activities, they feared, would be cultured.[370] By November, however, the papers in Britain were reporting nation-wide strikes across France – provoked, they claimed, by Communist agitators – affecting the coal industry, the Citroën and Renault plants, and resulting in riots in Marseilles.[371] It was the "acts of sabotage" on the railway lines at the end of November, however, which compromised Eliot's lectures in Marseilles and Aix, and

---

[368] E. Noël Paton to the Director of Budget and Control, memo, October 9, 1947, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours, 1945-1948", BW83/3, The National Archives, Kew.
[369] Charles de Winton (Deputy Representative, Italy) to Lectures Department, letter, October 10, 1947, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours, 1945-1948", BW83/3, The National Archives, Kew.
[370] Price, 346-7.
[371] "Communist Agitators Busy in France" *The Manchester Guardian* (November 19, 1947); 5.

reports in *The Manchester Guardian* of British travellers stranded in France likely contributed to the uncertainty over whether the visit could proceed.[372]

Much of the political agitation was provoked by the exchange of inflammatory rhetoric between all parties in the French Assembly. Whilst the Communist Party accused the Government of "'betraying workers' interests'", Schuman's Government actively suppressed any rhetoric suggestive of a revolution, confiscating copies of the Communist newspapers *Ce Soir* and *Humanité.* The introduction of emergency legislation to "mobilise 80,000 army reservists…to reinforce the police in maintaining order", and to put in place strict punishments for those who threatened and attacked non-strikers, prompted accusations by Communist politicians of a return to Vichyism.[373] Although Eliot's French lectures were cancelled, the last minute decision meant that he was still planning to deliver his speeches in Marseilles and Aix, the first on Poe and Valéry to which our attention will turn presently, and the second an acceptance speech for an honorary doctorate. A draft of this latter, held in the Hayward Bequest, demonstrates a remarkable alertness to the political battles raging across the Continent, where the strikes and public disorder were the ricocheted bullets of a pernicious first offensive – an exchange of rhetoric. "The crisis of our time may [thus] be viewed in the aspect of a crisis of language", Eliot declares in the speech originally to be delivered on December 6. There were, he argues, those who respect the etymological narrative of a word, who discern with precision and due care the correct word. Then there were those who consider only the auditory impact of a word, selected to provoke and move an auditor with the emotional facility but not the critical capacity to interrogate its usage. Instead of appealing to an individual's reason, Eliot was concerned that those engaged in politics were exercising a linguistic formula targeted at stirring the more powerful, actionable impulses of a group, rather than prompting individual introspective reflection. Politics and literature collide, for Eliot, in the ethical obligation they should observe with respect to language, urging scholars to adopt a discriminative practice in language use to be emulated outside of the university walls. Universities – and by extension cultural institutes – were

---

[372] "French Communist Papers Seized" *The Observer*, November 30, 1947; "'Overlanders'" Delayed by French Strike" *The Manchester Guardian,* November 25, 1947.

[373] "M. Schuman Warns the Communists" *The Manchester Guardian*, November 28, 1947; "French Communist Papers Seized" *The Observer*, November 30, 1947.

endowed with the responsibility to establish a criterion for what was essentially responsible language usage.[374]

This kernel of the idea that authors as well as politicians were, as custodians of a language, charged with respecting the genealogy of words re-emerges in another lecture also intended to be delivered in France on "Poe and His Influence on European Literature". Eliot would eventually deliver this lecture in France in April 1948 as "Edgar Poe et la France" (published in *La Table Ronde* in December 1948), which in turn formed the basis of *From Poe to Valéry*, also delivered in November 1948, this time to the Library of Congress.[375] Yet the lecture on Poe had its unplanned maiden outing in Italy amidst a political climate as equally tumultuous as that in France. In November, Italy was also faced with the prospect of Communist-provoked general strikes in a bid, it was feared, to oust the Christian Democrat De Gasperi Government. As in France, Italy's Communist Party had achieved success in parliamentary elections, and in 1946 was the third largest party in Government. Disputes raged both in Parliament and in the streets between Communist and Socialist factions and the conservative Christian Democrats. Violence erupted in many of the major cities in Italy, including Milan, Florence and Rome, with the British papers reporting widespread Communist-led lynchings and stormings by mobs of anti-Communist newspapers, as well as bombings of Communist Party headquarters.[376] Although since 1945, Italy had been attempting to draft a constitution which could accommodate the principles as various as those of the Communist and Christian Democrat Parties, it had been difficult to purge its bureaucracies of an endemic culture of belief that "the state was regarded as being prior to the individual", where "the citizen had no rights".[377] Laws relating to labour movements and strikes had been, therefore, unaltered since those drawn up under fascism, leading to excessive strikes and violent protests from Communist-linked trade unions.

---

[374] "Speech at Aix-En-Provence. 6 December 1947", "T. S. Eliot Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses [c. 1930] – 1955. H1. HB Quarto 1", Hayward Bequest, Kings College, Cambridge.
[375] According to Oser, 1500 copies of *From Poe to Valéry* were distributed by Eliot and his American publishers as a New Year's gift, and the lecture was re-published in the *Hudson Review* in 1949. See Lee Oser, *T. S. Eliot and American Poetry* (Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1998); 12.
[376] "Widespread Disorders in Italy" *The Manchester Guardian*, November 17, 1946.
[377] Christopher Duggan. *A Concise History of Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 246.

It was into a state of such political insecurity that Eliot arrived in Rome on December 8, merely weeks before the implementation of the new Constitution in January 1948. Eliot's first lecture was delivered on December 9 for *Fiera Letteraria* and the British Council at the Liceo Visconti to a sizeable audience. With the large number of English-speaking troops in Italy in the immediate post-War period, according to Donaldson, there was a concerted "interest in the English language, and by the time the peace treaty was signed there were 4,415 members enrolled in the Council Institutes".[378] This, coupled with Eliot's reputation, perhaps explains the presence of an 850-strong audience, which turned up despite pouring rain to attend a lecture on "Poetry in the Theatre".[379] The original script for this lecture appears not to exist, but a "Synopsis" drafted most likely by Bottrall, together with an account of the lecture in *L'Italia Socialista*, reveals not only a reiteration of ideas expressed in the 1942 "The Music of Poetry" lecture, but also a recycling of many of the theories set forth in the 1937 lecture "The Development of Shakespeare's Verse".[380]

Once again, Eliot takes up the misconception that poetry in the theatre is an archaic mode of dramatic expression, and the revival of a commercially successful theatre, due in part to the works of Ibsen and Shaw, had confirmed what had long been suspected; that serious themes could only be communicated through prose. The failure of a number of verse experiments in the theatre had appeared to confirm this view, a failure repeated by poets such as Tennyson, Browning and Swinburne because they could not adapt their versification to a conversational idiom requisite in a theatrical context. Indeed, evident in this synopsis is the role that Modernist poetry played in rehabilitating verse drama – [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] – but at the same time, the [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] were capable of extending beyond [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]

---

[378] Donaldson, 147.
[379] Ronald Bottrall to the "Lectures Department", letter, January 8, 1948, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew.
[380] This lecture was delivered in Edinburgh in 1937 but was never published, according to Jason Harding, because Eliot felt that they would need substantial revision. As the following discussion shows the ideas were resurrected in the lecture "Poetry in the Theatre" in Rome in 1947. Another lecture, bearing a similar title – "The Development of Shakespeare's Versification" – was, however, delivered in Hamburg in October 1949. See Jason Harding, "T. S. Eliot's Shakespeare." *Essays in Criticism* 62, no. 2 (2012): 174.

to which prose drama was bound.[381] As Eliot argued in the 1937 lecture, Shakespeare could propel the audience's consciousness beyond the emotional quotidian towards, to quote from the 1947 synopsis, a [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. In both lectures, Eliot argues that a poet may draw his attention beyond that [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], even beyond the realm of drama itself, to a point where only the musicality of poetry [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[382] The prosodic rhythms of verse drama allow the poet to express emotions in words which would ordinarily be collapsed by the Wittgensteinian *Grenzen* of the unspeakable.

As with Eliot's earlier 1945 French lecture on "The Social Function of Poetry", the appeal in Rome to dramatists to devise a recognisable and conversational prosodic idiom which could, simultaneously, convey emotions beyond "base passions" found consilience with political efforts to quell the inflammatory rhetoric responsible for stimulating strike action and social disorder in the Italian capital. Unsurprisingly, the review of the lecture in *L'Italia Socialista* was somewhat sceptical of the ideas of the self-proclaimed conservative for whom "[f]ame has been kind".[383] Eliot may "appeal to those of a snobbish disposition", it fumed, "[b]ut this

---

[381] "Synopsis of Lecture By Mr. T. S. Eliot On 'Poetry in the Theatre'" [Undated], "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew.

[382] See Eliot, "Development of Shakespeare's Verse", "Miscellaneous lectures HB/P/7 1937-1941", The Hayward Bequest. Kings College, Cambridge. Quotations taken from "Synopsis of Lecture By Mr. T. S. Eliot On 'Poetry in the Theatre'" [Undated], "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew. Square brackets denote written additions to the printed typsescript.

[383] "T, S, Eliot al Liceo Visconti" *L'Italia Socialista*, December 11, 1947. The original Italian is printed as follows:

Grande pubblico ieri sera all'Aula Magna del liceo visconti ad ascoltare ed applaudire il poeta inglese T. S. Eliot, senza dubbio il maggiore poeta inglese contemporaneo.

Molto ha giovata la fama. E molto anche lo snobismo che della gloria è, assai spesso, la miglior levatrice: ma che non può esimersi, almeno qui a Roma, dal giungere con un quarto d'ora di ritardo sull'orario annunciato.

Soltanto quando i vari gruppi di signore impellicciate e signorine, han cessato di agitarsi per la sala in cerca del posto più confacente alle loro "toilettes", e i più sprovveduti nel linguaggio materno del conferenziere han smesso di dileguarsi per la porta d'ingresso, la voce di Eliot, pacatamente distesa sulle parole, è giunta fino a noi.

doesn't excuse (at least not here in Rome) the fact that he arrived a quarter of an hour later than stated on the programme". From the outset, the author of the review makes clear that Eliot was not a speaker who either appealed or communicated to the masses. With those "less than fluent in the mother tongue of the conference guest" having to pass "back through the entrance portals", whilst "the various groups of fur-swathed ladies and young women…finished circulating the auditorium in search of a seat which favoured their ensembles", Eliot was here perceived as capable of communicating only with the well-educated and well-to-do. The essential premise of Eliot's lecture, moreover, that verse could elevate language to higher planes of emotional experience, was considered by this reviewer as a potentially "retrograde one": but, in the recounting of Eliot's assertion that the success of poetic drama was contingent upon the renewed efforts of multiple generations of poets, this reviewer is particularly attentive to the metaphors Eliot employs to stress a naturally occurring programme of linguistic regeneration:

> Literature thus becomes a stony soil to till, one in which generations of artists must succeed one another and perish in their turn, in order that from that tilled soil may come a new, full simplicity of expression, in which acceptance of the new language proves to be only a wider spiritual peace, from which to address a heterogeneous public.[384]

Once again, the language of revolution and sacrifice, which orbits in its political and social form the exterior walls of the lecture hall, is here reconstituted into a cultural cause. The agricultural metaphors as related here point to a mutually sustaining relationship between the author and literature as an organism, where even failures in

---

Il tema trattato "La poesia e il teatro" era un tema critico, destinato a riproporre una distinzione che, in sede estetica(?), sembra aver già fatto il suo tempo: si deve usare il verso o la prosa scrivendo di teatro? Eliot pensa che si debba tornare a scrivere in versi.

Posizione che potrebbe parare retrograda, ma che tradisce una alta preoccupazione di civilta letteraria, la ricerca di una espressione matura dei sentimenti non più affidati alla arbitrarietà di un palare prosastico, facilmente inquinato di interessi contingenti. Le lettere divengono così un'arduo campo da dissodare, in cui le generazione degli artisti devono succedersi e perire, perché dal terreno fecondato germogli infine la semplicità di un'espressione nuova e piena, in cui l'accettazione della norma sia soltanto una più vasta pace dello spirito, e come tale parli e anche al pubblico più eterogeneo.

Al termine della conferenza Eliot ha letto tre sue poesie.

[384] In comparison, the "Synopsis" offers a milder account:

[This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]

the artistic process can decompose to fertilize the ecosystem out of which new authors and new forms of expression can emerge.

Eliot's casting of dramaturgy as a physical craft, however, is symptomatic both of an evolved understanding of the practice, as well as of its relationship to the social environs in which it emerges. In the "The Development of Shakespeare's Verse", Eliot revises his critical appreciation of Shakespeare by retracting his earlier provocative criticisms of *Hamlet.*[385] This retraction, as Jason Harding notes, takes a more concrete form in *Poetry and Drama* (1951), but it echoes, too, in "Poetry in the Theatre" in his assessment of the "dramatically perfect" opening sequence of the play, which achieves that musical ascendency in verse to which poet-dramatists were to aspire. For Harding, this rescinding of criticism of *Hamlet* originates "from the standpoint of a man of the theatre". Indeed, it was "Shakespeare's long career as a popular dramatist catering for a diverse audience" that appealed to Eliot who was concerned with inspiring interest in the dramatic arts even in those normally apathetic to the drama: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] he claims in the 1947 lecture, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[386]

Eliot conceived the act of producing drama as a labour-intensive craft, describing himself as a "workman in verse" in 1937. Armed with this conception of his profession, which ten years later was mediated through a metaphor of agricultural labour, this was a powerful leitmotif to express in a country not only crippled by striking manual labourers and blue-collar workers, but also whose Constitution decreed the nation a "Republic founded on work".[387] With Eliot's own lectures affected by the attacks on Italy's infrastructure by strike action (a general strike on December 12 meant those who attended Eliot's second lecture on Poe had to walk across the city), it becomes evident that the breakdown in the infrastructure which keeps a social community mobile has its correlative in the infrastructure within the theatre upon which the playwright and the development of language is dependent.[388]

---

[385] Eliot, "Hamlet and his Problems." *The Athenaeum (*September 26, 1919): 940-941.
[386] Jason Harding, "T. S. Eliot's Shakespeare." *Essays in Criticism* 62, no. 2 (2012): 171; "Synopsis of Lecture By Mr. T. S. Eliot On 'Poetry in the Theatre'" [Undated], "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew.
[387] "Italy Given New Constitution" *The Times*, December 23, 1947.
[388] Ronald Bottrall to the "Lectures Department", letter, January 8, 1948,

Indeed, as he explains in "Poetry in the Theatre", poet-dramatists rely on a network – a community – comprised of [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[389]

In such countries as France and Italy, where strike action was not only an endemic problem to the nation but also spreading between nations on the Continent, the insistence on a return to the local in the theatre was by no means to be considered a distraction from the wider national concerns. Localism was, in fact, a part of their solution. National cultures were strengthened – their identities solidified –when their constituent regional cultures flourished. In a decentralised society, Eliot elaborates in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* the following year, community concerns were not with national but rather with community issues, "on which local populations could form an opinion from their own experience and from conversation with their neighbours", without such issues becoming viral within a nation. The effect was that politicians had to adapt their rhetoric to these very particular, regional problems, moving the content of their "political utterances" away from potentially inflammatory rhetoric towards "greater clarity" and "fewer variations of interpretation". Although Eliot refers, here, to the "greatest muster of ambiguities and obscure generalities" which comprises national and international addresses, it is such factors which stimulate dangerous misunderstandings and encourage the spread of direct protest. Directing the focus of communities back towards their local culture – towards, in this case, local theatres – promotes a stronger sense of regional identity and cohesiveness within a nation of comparably resilient local cultures, and so preventing in theory the dominance of any one region.[390]

The prescription for a localism for verse drama, where it could rely on a "small but *constant* public", was reminiscent both of the repertory companies that flourished during the War and The Group Theatre company where, in 1934, Eliot introduced his own first experimental play, *Sweeney Agonistes,* to Britain. Relying heavily on audience subscriptions and the willingness of professional actors to work for free, The Group Theatre, in what Eliot terms the "ecology of cultures", provided

---

"Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew.

[389] "Synopsis of Lecture By Mr. T. S. Eliot On 'Poetry in the Theatre'" [Undated], "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew.

[390] *Notes*, 87-88.

an environment in which a new verse idiom could come into contact with a local audience – a micro-culture – in itself a part of that "constellation of cultures, the constituents of which, benefiting each other benefit the whole".[391] A national culture, in other words, expands as local cultures come into contact with each other. Indeed, in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948), Eliot not only stresses the principle that local cultures "should harmonise with, and enrich, the cultures of the neighbouring areas", but also that the most significant generative potential of a national culture – its ability to expand – derives in fact from the "*friction* between its parts". Divisions in a nation between class and region, he further posits, "lead to a conflict favourable to creativeness and progress", where the greater the number of conflicts between regions creates a complex network of allies and enemies, which in fact mitigate against the prospect of outright civil war: "everyone should be an ally of everyone else in some respects, and an opponent in several others, and no one conflict, envy or fear will dominate".[392] Essentially, this form of regional competition mitigates, too, against the unity enforced in nations such as Germany and Italy where strong regional identities had been cultivated and had prevailed for centuries: "the attempt to teach Germans to think of themselves as Germans first, and the attempt to teach Italians to think of themselves as Italians first, rather than as natives of a particular small principality or city, was to disturb the traditional culture from which alone any further culture could grow".[393]

Eliot's tentative pressing of his suit for the need for verse drama to take root in the small, community theatres of the regions in Italy corresponds with the development of political regionalism in Italy in 1947. Regional government was the key concession in the new Constitution, "partly designed to weaken the power of central government and to promote local democracy; but it also reflected fears about separatism".[394] As *The Times* reported in terms very similar to those echoed in Eliot's

---

[391] *Notes*, 58.
[392] *Notes*, 58-9.
[393] *Notes*, 60.
[394] Duggan, 249. Sicily, Sardinia, Valle d'Aosta and the South Tyrol were all pressing for autonomy, and it was hoped that granting some form of regional power would stifle calls for complete devolution. In *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, Eliot, too, concedes the dangers of devolution within the British context, acknowledging that the *cultural* autonomy of Wales and Scotland were vital to the continual flourishing of English culture, which would itself disappear were these "peripheral" cultures be subsumed within it. See *Notes*, 56-7.

Notes, "[t]he excessive centralism which flowed from the manner of unification, only to be distorted out of all measure by the rigid bureaucracy of fascism, is to give way to a broad system of regional autonomy". Italy was to be divided into regions governed by elected councils to accommodate the desire of left-leaning parties to "inculcat[e] the practice and precepts of self-government in the routine and custom of Italian life".[395] The new Constitution was attempting to establish that mind set outlined by Eliot only a few months later "that a man should feel himself to be, not merely a citizen of a particular nation, but a citizen of a particular part of his country, with local loyalties", a mind set which was, however, an important handicap in the reception of that "displaced European" Edgar Allan Poe.

"Poe and his Influence on European Literature" was delivered to an audience of 550 at the Villa Patrizi on December 12 during a national strike, when [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[396] In the 1949 published version of this lecture, Eliot begins by questioning not only the range of Poe's influence, but also the disparity in the reception of Poe between English-speaking countries, where his influence had seemed "almost negligible", and France, on which his impact had been "immense".[397] The dispersed nature of Poe's body of work, however, usually seen in fragments of a few poems and short stories, made the influence he had on poets of Eliot's generation an inconspicuous one: "one cannot be sure that one's own writing has *not* been influenced by Poe". Yet what could account, Eliot asks, for the direct influence Poe exerted over three generations of French poets as Mallarmé, Valéry, and Baudelaire? Eliot claims to "make no attempt to explain the enigma" before proceeding to suggest that what these three poets took from Poe, as non-speakers of English they took in translation a unified body of work.[398] Anglo-American critics, "more inclined to make separate judgements of the different parts of an author's work", tended to fragment Poe's work, and, in doing so, were both more

---

[395] "A Constitution for Italy" *The Times*, December 24, 1947. In reality, however, despite being enshrined in the 1948 Constitution, regional government was not actually established until 1970.
[396] Ronald Bottrall to the "Lectures Department", letter, January 8, 1948, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/3, The National Archives, Kew.
[397] Eliot, "From Poe to Valéry." *The Hudson Review* 2, no. 3 (Autumn, 1949): 327.
[398] "From Poe to Valéry", 328.

attentive to the linguistic inaccuracies which pervaded his poetry and more aware "of the blemishes and imperfections of Poe's actual writing".[399]

This was not, however, a blanket approach employed by Anglo-American critics, with Eliot enjoining in "The Development of Shakespeare's Verse" that Shakespeare's plays cannot be considered in isolation, but could only be understood in their sequential whole. Unlike Poe, however, this is possible because an identifiable, consistent development can be seen to take place in Shakespeare's work, a playwright who benefited from a localism in his drama through his contact with other dramatists such as Marlowe and Jonson within a specific province. This universalism is not identified in the themes or narratives evident in the plays: rather, "[t]here is something much more *local* about the languages in which Shakespeare and Racine had to express themselves", he writes in *Dante*. Shakespeare's universalism emerged concurrently with his development of an idiom approximate to the "ordinary conversation" of his audience, an approximation that can only be achieved through constant contact with, and awareness of, that common idiom.[400] Even Dante, who achieved universality in an Italian idiom derived from a transnational medieval Latin, cultivated a universalism which seemed to "inhere in Dante's Florentine speech; and the localization ('Florentine' speech) seems if anything to emphasize the universality, because it cuts across the modern division of nationality".[401]

The inability of critics to accommodate Poe in either an English or American tradition of letters is accounted for by a peculiar form of "provinciality":

> a provinciality of the person who is not at home where he belongs, but cannot get to anywhere else. Poe is a kind of displaced European; he is attracted to Paris, to Italy and to Spain, to places which he could endow with romantic gloom and grandeur. Although his ambit of movement hardly extended beyond the limits of Richmond and Boston longitudinally, and neither east nor west of these centres, he seems a wanderer with no fixed abode. There can be few authors of such eminence who have drawn so little from their own roots, who have been so isolated from any surroundings.[402]

---

[399] "From Poe to Valéry", 331.
[400] See "Development of Shakespeare's Verse" in "Miscellaneous lectures HB/P/7 1937-1941", The Hayward Bequest. Kings College, Cambridge.
[401] Eliot, *Dante*, 18.
[402] "From Poe to Valéry"; 329.

Although Eliot would concede in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* that migration needn't be an obstacle to developing an affinity with a community other than one's birth place, a poet's development was contingent upon his taking roots, whether imaginatively or literally, in a specific community.[403] Indeed, Poe's displaced wandering is transmuted into a linguistic vagrancy. Like a magpie stealing from place to place, acquiring and discarding its spoils mid-flight, in Poe's poetic idiom the twine that binds together the signifier and the signified becomes frayed in transit. Poe comes to select his words for their acoustic value, disregarding, Eliot claims, their dictionary meaning, essentially stripping them of their historic, localized, properties. In tones reminiscent of that caution uttered in the cancelled Aix-en-Provence speech, "[S]ound and sense must cooperate," Eliot asserts, for "in even the must purely incantatory poem, the dictionary meaning of words cannot be disregarded with impunity."[404] Unable, or perhaps resistant to, establishing himself within a community where his own idiom could flourish into a recognizably modern poetic, meant that Poe's verse could neither fertilize nor be fertilized by the "constellation of cultures" in which that community and its language resided. It remained, as Eliot concluded, in a state peculiar to a "highly gifted young person before puberty", devoid of that "maturity of intellect which comes only with the maturing of the man as a whole".[405]

Eliot's assessment of Poe the "provincial", "displaced European", caught between the leafy suburbs of Boston and Richmond, and a "wanderer of no fixed abode", lures, somewhat mischievously, the critic into drawing analogies between Eliot's own position and that of Poe's. Indeed, Lee Oser has claimed that Eliot, in his lecture, "several times hints at likenesses between himself and his subject, such as the course of movement from the South to the North, the attraction to dark European atmospheres, which we see in Eliot's gothic *Waste Land* [sic] passage, and the notion of an exiled 'provinciality'".[406] By 1947, however, Eliot's own sense of an exiled displacement appears to have abated, his work with the BBC and the British Council, in addition to his receiving the Order of Merit on his return from Italy in January 1948, seemingly confirming his status as at least institutionally British. Not wishing to conceal his naturalized identity, the liminal position he inhabited was galvanized by

---

[403] *Notes*; 52.
[404] "From Poe to Valéry"; 332.
[405] "From Poe to Valéry"; 335.
[406] Oser, 12-13.

an understanding, accrued during the years of his citizenship application, that the "displaced" person – or the unplaced art – could germinate most successfully from within a local community. Moreover, the popularity of his plays at home and abroad indicate that in sculpting a prosody from the ordinary vernacular of his adopted locale, a prosody both adaptable to foreign voices and translation, Eliot had succeeded in establishing himself in a community where his own idiom could flourish, an accomplishment never achieved by Poe.

In his 1948 Nobel Prize Speech, Eliot concedes that "[p]oetry is usually considered the most local of all the arts", seeming to "separate[e] peoples instead of uniting them".[407] But poetry, he reasoned, provided an impetus to overcome a language barrier, and if practical evidence had to be provided to support Eliot's assertion that developing a prosody of the vernacular from within a specific region needn't result in merely provincial work, it might be found in the appeals from abroad for Eliot as a speaker. Indeed, in December 1948, the Vienna Office of the British Council requested that Eliot be invited to undertake a tour of Austria, including Vienna, Graz and Innsbruck, on the principal basis that

> [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[408]

First performed for the Friends of Canterbury Cathedral as part of the Festival of Music and Drama in June 1935, Eliot's most renowned play was nearly fifteen years old in 1949 and still very much in demand, having been broadcast in Germany that year. Furthermore, Eliot's British Council tour to Hamburg between October 27 and 31 followed up a successful premiere of *The Cocktail Party* at the Edinburgh Festival to promote regional innovation within the British Isles, and coincided with its production in New York (starring Alec Guinness) in what would be Eliot's most

---

[407] Eliot, "Banquet Speech," Nobel Prize, accessed June 5, 2014, http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1948/eliot-speech.html.

[408] Vienna Office of the British Council to the Lectures Department, letter, December 20, 1948, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/9, The National Archives, Kew. Eliot felt that the tour to Austria, on top of the German tour, would have been too arduous. On March 27, 1950 Eliot wrote to Noel-Paton acknowledging the urgency of conducting a tour to Austria, proposing that he visit in 1951 following a series of lectures he was to deliver on the East Coast of America in the Autumn of 1950. The proposed tour, however, never took place. See TSE to D. E. Noel-Paton, letter, March 27, 1950, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/9, The National Archives, Kew.

commercially lucrative play.[409] Indeed, if drama was to form the backbone of this lecture tour, it was no surprise that one of the stipulations of Eliot's agreeing to the invitation was that Ashley Dukes, Eliot's producer at the Mercury Theatre and rights manager for his plays, was to be [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[410]

Dukes, as the Theatre Adviser to the Commander-in-Chief of the British Zone in Germany, was not only well placed as a mediator between the British Council, the British and American Occupation authorities and the German Section of the Foreign Office to ensure that Eliot's tour could proceed without diplomatic complications, but he was also, as the Director of German and Austrian Department of the Council, G. L. Hitchcock suspected, keen to garner press coverage for Eliot's plays. Dukes, Hitchcock wrote in a Memo between Bottrall and the Director of the Lectures Department, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], hinting at the publicity that might be generated from the tour.[411]

If it was principally as a dramatist that Eliot was known in both Germany and Austria, it was through drama that once again he would direct his social criticism. Having delivered the "The Social Function of Poetry" in France in 1945, an adapted version of this lecture was given as "The Aims of Poetic Drama" on October 28, followed by two lectures on October 29: a revival of "The Development of Shakespeare's Versification" at Hamburg University, and "The Idea of a European Society" at Die Brücke (the British Information Centre).[412] Although Eliot's programme for Hamburg resembles a composite of the previous lectures delivered in the Council's name, drawing as he did in Italy on the material which would eventually

---

[409] Eliot and Ashley Dukes left for Berlin on October 31, although records for the tour to Göttingen, Bonn, Cologne, Munster, Heidelberg and Munich do not appear in the Council files in The National Archives.

[410] Ronald Bottrall to G. L. Hitchcock (Director, German and Austria Department) and the Director of the Lectures Department of the British Council, memo, January 14, 1949, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/9, The National Archives, Kew.

[411] Ronald Bottrall to G. L. Hitchcock (Director, German and Austria Department) and the Director of the Lectures Department of the British Council, memo, January 14, 1949, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/9, The National Archives, Kew.

[412] "The Aims of Poetic Drama" [Hamburg] would be further refined into "Poetry and Drama" for Harvard in 1950. This is not the same essay which would later be delivered before the Theatre Guild in 1949.

coalesce into *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture,* the culturally reparative work being undertaken in Germany was of another calibre altogether.

2.2 The British Council Lectures in Germany

In the post-War years up until late 1949, Hamburg was still an occupied British zone, and the zoning system itself created a peculiar cultural friction and competition between the occupying countries. Indeed, consider the resources Russia invested in positioning itself as a cultural leader and regenerator in the War's aftermath, establishing blatant competition with an Allied programme of a Western qua "democratic" cultural war of attrition. Within months of the War's end, amidst the economic and social devastation of Berlin, and on a post-War budget inconceivable to most of the Allied countries, Russia had arranged for a production of Gluck's *Orpheus* to mark the opening of the opulently refurbished State Opera. By 1947, moreover, it had unveiled a "House of Culture", the grandiosity of which, according to a British cultural affairs officer, "'surpasses anything the other allies have done and puts our poor little effort right in the shade'".[413] With its plush interiors and impressive luxury, coupled with its well-heated rooms – unheard of in the extreme 1947 freeze – British efforts seemed pathetic. With only "'one information centre and a few reading rooms which have had to be closed down because of lack of coal!'", it was all too easy to anticipate the House of Culture's ability to "'reach the broad masses and do much to counteract the generally accepted idea here that the Russians are uncivilized'".[414] Better equipped to engage in cultural sparring with the Russians, the Americans retaliated by opening the Amerika-Häuser, institutes which "offered respite from the bitter weather in comfortably furnished reading rooms, and gave film showings, music recitals, talks and art exhibits", all of which pointed to the cultural accomplishments of America.[415] In comparison, with Government funding for the British Council actually diminishing in the most important years leading up to the Cold War, the Council, unable to afford the sort of opulent institutions established by

[413] Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta Books, 2000), 18.
[414] Quoted in Stonor Saunders, 19.
[415] Stonor Saunders, 19.

either the Russians or Americans, depended on the organized lecture tours undertaken by its cultural and scientific elite.[416]

Yet it was neither wealth nor opulence in which Eliot sought to trade on his visit to Germany; flashy demonstrations of economic power were to do little to undermine the aggressive cultural propaganda disseminated under Nazism, and Eliot made it clear as early as January 1949 that the tour was to take place when Universities in the key cities across Germany were in session.[417] Indeed, at Hamburg University, Eliot explicitly revived a lecture – "The Development of Shakespeare's Versification" – that he had long considered unfit for publication, but, in a revised form, seemingly fit for purpose as a means of restoring a "British" Shakespeare in the German imagination. As Gerwin Strobl has uncovered, German theatres were remarkably active during the War years in comparison to Britain, with 13,052 productions taking place within Austrian and German theatres alone during that period.[418] Under the Minister of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels, conflicting assessments of Shakespeare had created a rather ambivalent perception of his work and status. Although there were frequent "denunciations" of Shakespeare's works as being "incompatible with Nazi notions of the heroic", there was a surge in popularity of Shakespeare that emanated from *Mein Kampf*, in which Hitler had proclaimed the "'Nordic'" and "'Germanic'" Shakespeare a "central pillar of German theatre".[419] As the Hitler Youth put on a festival of all the history plays, and some of Germany's most revered actors assumed the heroic titular roles of *Richard III* (Werner Krauss), *Richard II* (Gustaf Gründgens and Rudolf Forster), and *Hamlet* (Gründgens), Strobl notes that the weekly paper *Das Reich* reported on the disappearance of Shakespeare from Britain's stage: not to worry though, they wrote gleefully, for he had re-emerged in Germany.[420]

---

[416] According to Donaldson, as a result of the devaluation of the pound, the Council's budget was dramatically cut by 10 per cent, so that "by 1950 regional centres in France (Nancy and Lille) and the Institute at Rome had been closed", and other centres transferred Anglophile societies. See Donaldson, 152-3.
[417] Ronald Bottrall to G. L. Hitchcock (Director, German and Austria Department) and the Director of the Lectures Department of the British Council, memo, January 14, 1949, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/9, The National Archives, Kew.
[418] Gerwin Strobl, *The Swastika and the Stage: German Theatre and Society, 1933-1945* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); 213.
[419] Strobl; 177.
[420] Strobl; 177, 211.

As we have already seen, Eliot's lecture to a large extent militates against the general ordering, and popularity, of Shakespeare's plays over others, for in the competition between subject matter and the refinement of Shakespeare's poetry is concealed the narrative of the transition of his verse from a poetry of rhetoric to that of conversation: Shakespeare developed a verse idiom not of the politician or the gods, but of the vernacular. Restoring the narrative of the diachronic development in Shakespeare's verse from rhetoric into a vernacular style in touch with the mass audience, and eventually beyond that audience – that is, understanding Shakespeare's oeuvre within a specifically British context of verse development – serves both to depoliticize and weaken the invested, ahistorical significance attached to individual plays. Isolating individual plays – re-historicising them into a contemporary political moment – not only diminished the perspective one could have of Shakespeare's construction of a vernacular idiom, but it discouraged contemporary drama from responding directly to, and cultivating a vernacular reflective of, its own historical moment.

Indeed, in his previous lecture on "The Aims of Poetic Drama", Eliot relates how even in the composition of an historical play such as *Murder in the Cathedral*, the challenge lay in "escaping the verse of Shakespeare" and a tradition of verse drama which had sustained iambic pentameter, like an antiquated and increasingly resented family heirloom, through to the nineteenth century. "[A]rt never improves", he reminds us in "Tradition and the Individual Talent", but the "material of art is never quite the same", and poets who merely "conform" to the standards of the past risk progression by being "amputated" by those standards.[421] Poets such as Tennyson had "been unable to escape the echoes of Shakespeare", and as a result the synchronic relationship between the temporal setting of the play and its linguistic manifestation tended to dissolve: "Hence their language never sounds quite like *conversation*--and to suggest conversation, you must suggest the conversation of your own age, not that of some great predecessor generations ago".[422]

I have suggested throughout this chapter that Eliot mediated and discursively rerouted the linguistic energy of national collective action into a rhythm confined to the local, and the return of a verse idiom to a temporal as well as a physical locality as suggested here shows a consistent development of this thought in response to a

[421] Eliot, *The Sacred Wood* (London: Faber and Faber, 1997), 42.
[422] Eliot, "The Aims of Poetic Drama", 11.

changing political and cultural environment. Eliot's lectures in Germany, however, also coincided with political developments in European unity, with Churchill in 1946 calling for a United States of Europe quite different to Hitler's conception of a united Europe comprised of vassal states. The "mind of Europe" to which the poet was to be aware in "Tradition and the Individual Talent" was still a "mind which changes"; yet by 1949 Europe was not the primary cultural unit.[423] Indeed, the final lecture delivered in Hamburg on "The Idea of a European Society" reveals an anxiety over a federal unity which commanded a primary loyalty to a European union over local, regional and national allegiance: "One Europe consisting of mass of individuals committed only to maintaining a felt loyalty to Europe would be a mere machine".[424] Communities had to adapt to national and international changes, but, for the sake of diversity between nations in Europe, local identities and traditions not only had to be preserved, they had to flourish and fertilize each other.[425] Considerable attention, Eliot remarks, had been paid in the War's aftermath to the relationship between the nation and the world at the expense of neglecting the vital nerve between the village and Europe.[426] Nations may be comprised of constituent local cultures, but they were

---

[423] *The Sacred Wood*, 42.

[424] Eliot, "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft" *Hamburger Akademische Rundschau* 3 (1950): 729-730. "Eine Europa, bestehend aus einer Masse von Individuen, die sich nichts anderem gegenüber zur Loyalität verpflichtet fühlten als nur Europa, wäre eine blosse Maschine. Wir können unsere Loyalität gegenüber der Nation nicht unterdrücken oder ersetzen, denn die Nation ist mehr als eine Anzahl von Menschen, die die gleiche Sprache sprechen und anderen Nationen das Nachsehen geben möchten. Die Nation ist eine kulturelle Einheit. Aber sie is nicht die einzige kulturelle Einheit". All German translations by the author.

[425] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 730. The German original reads: "Denn Leben ist Veränderung, kleine Gebiete müssen sich ebenso umstellen wie grosse. Aber jeder Bezirk, jede Stadt und jedes Dorf sollten im Wechsel die Identität bewahren; ich kann nicht zugeben, dass Veränderung und Fortschritt notwendigerweise einen Bodengewinn für die Uniformität bedeuten".

[426] Indeed, Eliot's own 1946 broadcast to Germany on "The Unity of European Culture" adopted a slightly different tenor to that address delivered in Hamburg in 1949. Broadcast just a year after the foundation of UNESCO, in the "The Unity of European Culture" Eliot predicates the historic and future unity of Europe and its shared culture to be founded not on a unity local differences, but rather on the powerful shared belief system of Christianity: "The Western world has its unity in this heritage, in Christianity and in the ancient civilisations of Greece, Rome and Israel, from which, owing to two thousand years of Christianity, we trace our descent. […] No political and economic organisation, however much good will it commands, can supply what this culture unity gives". As "trustees", benefactors and preservers of a shared cultural heritage rooted in Christian tradition, it was up to the men of letters,

not in themselves self-sufficient units ("selbstgenügsame Einheit"), thriving instead – influencing and being influenced by – the exchange with other nations.[427]

Eliot's insistence in his discussion with Ronald Bottrall that he should have access to the principal university towns in Germany did not simply emerge out a desire for greater exposure to an intellectual quarter of that nation: rather, universities in themselves were the convergence points between the regional and the international. Universities could derive their character and even their intellectual specialisms from the regions they inhabit, but the exchange of this knowledge took place within an extended international network. No university, he reminded his German audience, "should be viewed as a national institution, even if it is funded by the state". Yet, where universities across the nations should be bound by a set of shared ideals and intellectual principles – and not those imposed by a centralized government – "I would be very suspicious", he maintained, "of any plan to bring the different universities into uniformity".[428] A university was both an international and regional center, where each citizen brought to bear upon the university's intellectual signature the residue of the educational and cultural values of their region, and it was upon this principle that universities could retain a cultural autonomy of their own.

Suspicious of attempts to impose artificial structural and cultural ties between European nations without allowing for the organic growth of a cultural root system, it is in "The Idea of a European Society" that Eliot makes the social and political ramifications of the literary talks much more explicit than in his previous Council lectures. For in his final address, Eliot thoroughly evaluates the extent to which the poet's fingerprint is left on the final product of a verse drama, in what is effectively a re-architecting of the objective correlative principle into a socio-political paradigm. In a "seeming digression" to his talk on the nascent European Community as a political construct, Eliot seeks to recalibrate what are often taken to be mutually exclusive

---

rather than such organisations as the British Council, to ensure that European cohesion was maintained through a shared understanding and acknowledgemend of *cultural heritage* and legacy of Christianity.

[427] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 731.

[428] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 732-3. "[K]eine Universität sich als nationale Einrichtung betrachten sollte, selbst wenn sie vom Staat erhalten werd; vielmehr sollten sich die Universitäten aller Nationen gegenseitiger Treue und der zu gemeinsamen Idealen versichern. Und dies soll einie direkte Verbindung von Universität sein, und nicht eine, die von den betreffenden Regierungen arrangiert ist. Anderseits wäre ich sehr misstrauisch gegen jeden Plan, die verschiedenen Universitäten zur Uniformität zu bringen."

terms: binaries of "growth and structure, mechanism and organism, the planned and the spontaneous, conscious and unconscious" govern, he argues, the way we perceive social change. The construction of verse, however, is a process where these binaries frequently cooperate. Although the impetus to compose a poem may originate from an "emotional and intellectual complex" ("ein Gefühls- und Gedankenkomplex") so powerful that it provokes disquiet ("beunruhigt") if never articulated, or brought into the world, the labour is never an entirely organic or natural process: "the real process of birth involves a good deal of deliberate searching for the right word", so that the actual mechanics involved in the composition can radically alter the properties of the "unborn child".[429]

Conversely, in commissioned works such as *The Rock* and *Murder in the Cathedral*, where the compulsion to construct precedes the ready availability of the intellectual materials for construction, the very process of cultivating and collating these materials contributes to the evolution of the framework of the plays. If "planning directs growth" the potential for mutability in the process of growth means that "growth steers the next stage of planning. Afterwards, I cannot say, and I do not think that anyone else could, what touches upon inspiration and what upon calculation. These two cannot be separated in a work of art".[430] It is at the site where the organic and calculated process of creation collide that the poet's autonomy gives way to a collaborative undertaking. Indeed, both the playwright and the social builder ("der Baumeister des Sozialen") are, Eliot concludes, governed by the same principles of communal creation: that is, the social builder must intuit the materials with which he works whilst acknowledging that those materials are commonly owned. Both the poet and the social designer are subject to the influence of those who are similarly invested in how those materials are utilized and the development of a blueprint for the end product, who are not only on hand to alert him to "errors in his design", but also to remind him that "the plan must be helped to shape the material just as the material is transformed by the effects of the plan".[431] The composite process of a calculated

---

[429] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 728. "Vielleicht gehe ich lediglich von der Wahrnehmung aus, daß in mir ein Gefühls- und Gedankenkomplex sei, den ich irgendwie in Worte fassen muß, einfach darum, weil ich mich beunruhigt fühle, solange dieser Embryo nicht zur Welt gebracht ist".

[430] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 728.

[431] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 728-9. "Deshalb neige ich zu der Ansicht, dass der Baumeister des Sozialen; der Planer, einiges Gefühl für die Natur

intention by the author and the social planner, conscious intervention by others with an investment in the shared resources for developing a society or a language, and the organic evolution in the application of these materials to a fluid blueprint, allows for the cultivation of either a prosody or a social structure which is entirely familiar. Certainly in the theatre, the corrective impulse of an audience and an artistic community with a shared objective in the cultivation of a prosody of the vernacular, allows for the momentary effacement of the author when the audience finds "their ordinary, sordid, dreary world is suddenly illuminated and transfigured".[432] When the poet extracts his material from the language of an audience, the "intense moments" at which they become attentive to the poetry should be intuitive: they should feel, he argues, that "there are moments in life when poetry is the *natural* form of expression of ordinary men and women".[433] In the mutual education that takes place between an author and an audience, where "it is the business of audiences to educate the poets, as much as it is the business of poets to educate the audiences", it is not to the verse of Eliot to which they should, primarily be alerted, but rather a verse made familiar by their own contribution.[434]

Eliot's German tour in the autumn of 1949 would be the last British Council assignment that he would undertake. As cultural warfare became more insidious with the escalation of the Cold War, he consciously distanced himself from any obvious association with organizations involved in, or suspected of, post-War propaganda, refusing even Stephen Spender's request to publish in *Encounter*, "as it was so 'obviously published under American auspices'".[435] As this account has sought to show over the last two chapters, Eliot was unremitting in his commitment to the principle that for national cultures to flourish, there must be established cultural trade routes to allow for cross-fertilization between countries. The genesis of this idea, as the first chapter sought to relate, emerged out of a Liberal ideological principle of free

---

des von ihm bearbeiteten Materials braucht, und dass alle, die ein solches Gefühle für das Material haben, wohl imstande sein möchten, den Planer auf Fehler in seinem Entwurf aufmerksam zu machen und ihn daran zu erinnern, dass der Plan vom Material mitgestaltet sein muss, wie andererseits das Material von den Auswirkungen des Planes verwandelt wird".

[432] "The Aims of Poetic Drama"

[433] Eliot, *The Aims of Poetic Drama: the Presidential Address to the Poets' Theatre Guild* (London: 1949), 6.

[434] *The Aims of Poetic Drama,* 3.

[435] Stonor Saunders, 186.

trade, which endured in Eliot's conceptual understanding of the mechanics of cultural growth beyond the lifespan of early twentieth-century Liberalism itself. Yet the poet's appeal to the "mind of Europe" – where cultural material accumulates and mutates through time, forming the memetic residue transferred between generations of artists – which had formed the foundation of *The Criterion*'s European network of intellectual exchange, became an increasingly untenable position by the mid 1930s. Hitler's radical understanding of European unification, consisting of a "'confederation, but not of equal partners, a confederation of subordinate peoples'" governed by a uniform ideology, meant that any suggestion of a single European mind needed to be recalibrated.[436] Indeed, in his understanding of the way that culture and ideas migrate between nations within Europe, Eliot needed to develop a more complex blueprint, strengthening the European mind by weakening it: in essence, giving primacy to the local within this larger intellectual network.

In the economic, political and social disorder which spread through countries such as France and Italy in the aftermath of WWII, an appeal to localism and regionalism had implications beyond the strengthening of a national culture from the grassroots. As Eliot delivered his lectures in Italy and France encouraging a return to the regional vernacular in verse drama, he did so during labour strikes fuelled, according to press reports, by Communist Party agitators and the blanket rhetoric of politicians. The interests and politics of local communities and regions became subordinated by uncoordinated and non-specific calls for agitation, and by 1949 Eliot was cognisant of the more complex relationships people had to their local communities, their nation, and to Europe. "A person can be a nationalist in his province, and a provincialist in his nation," he asserted in "The Idea of a European Society", but "a person can also be a provincialist in Europe".[437] Localism and provincialism were not inevitable bedfellows, and the reconstruction of national cultures was contingent on the fertilizing processes occurring between localities within a nation. In addition to the breakdown of national cultural infrastructures, in the wake of both Wars economic and diplomatic tensions obstructed the key cultural trade routes between nations, but the contact, and even friction between, local

[436] James D. Wilkinson, *The Intellectual Resistance in* Europe (Boston, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1981), 173.
[437] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 737. "Man kann ein Nationalist in seiner Provinz sein und ein Provincler in seiner Nation; man kann auch ein Provinzler in Europa sein".

communities, Eliot argued, disallowed for a dangerous emergence of provincial ideology with the potential for overwhelming other regional cultures to the national detriment.

Whilst *The Criterion* was subject to criticism of its intellectual provincialism, Eliot's British Council lectures allowed him access to locales and regions, and a cross-section of the European community, barred to the periodical. Throughout World War II, of course, Eliot had overcome the obstacles to intellectual free trade in a more powerful – and certainly less arduous – format: the radio. Here, as he would discover in his broadcasts to Germany and India during the War, Eliot had gone some way to overcoming the tariff problem: economic borders were surmountable over the airwaves, and he was able to appeal to an audience potentially isolated from British intellectual discourse by press and import embargos. Such broadcasts had increased Eliot's profile abroad, making him a valuable asset to the British Council. Yet whilst the radio was a powerful tool in the dissemination and promotion worldwide of British culture, the BBC was decidedly neither locally inclined nor was it a reliable method of preserving a record of these cultural transfers. Very rarely did the BBC keep records of its wartime broadcasts, with Eliot's first ever radio broadcasts of *Four Quartets* still untraceable. With the British Council's self-styled mandate to promote a survey of the development of British culture, its impetus for recording specific linguistic moments within poetry made it a more reliable repository, whilst some of Eliot's international hosts seemed more eager than the BBC to obtain an oral record of his impact.

One of Eliot's final appointments in Hamburg was to record on behalf of The British Forces Network (BFN) a fifteen-minute special programme, in which he read part of *The Waste Land*, "The Hollow Men", *Ash Wednesday*, and "How Unpleasant to Meet Mr. Eliot".[438] Although these broadcasts have not, at the moment of writing, been retrieved, there is reason to believe they were recorded, with a British Council report of Eliot's tour noting that the [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[439] The BFN was one of the most powerful radio stations

[438] Alan Grace, *This is the British Forces Network: The Story of Forces Broadcasting in Germany* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1996), 81-2. "The programme, introduced by Cliff Michelmore, was a coup for BFN as T. S. Eliot had been on a tight schedule".
[439] Representative of the British Council, Hamburg, to G. L. Hitchcock, letter, November 24, 1949, "Specialist Tours; London Sponsored Tours 1945-1948", BW 83/9, The National Archives, Kew.

in Hamburg at the time in terms of broadcast range, having been established at the end of war to replace the army's mobile broadcasting units. With its objective being to broadcast to the whole of the British Zone, it was to be operated by military personnel whilst drawing on programmes broadcast by the BBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Overseas Recording Broadcasting Service and the American Forces Network to build up a representative allied network.[440] As Eliot had found with his broadcasts to Sweden seven years earlier, this was a unique and targeted method of publicizing his poetry and increasing his public profile. Yet Eliot's poetry recordings for the Swedish Broadcasting System, including "La Figlia Che Piange", Part V of *The Waste Land* and Part V of *East Coker*, not only coincided with the reopening of the publishing trade routes between Sweden and Britain, but also with the publication of a volume of Eliot's poems in translation, *Dikter I Urval*.[441] With import and export embargoes in place during and immediately after the War, in addition to high inflation which made the purchase of books – especially slim volumes of poetry – a luxury, recordings were an economic method of overcoming trade barriers to cultural exchange.

Yet whilst the recordings undertaken for the German and Swedish broadcasting systems were effective schemes of directly promoting the tours, the British Council's own approach to their poetry recording programme operated within a distinctive recording tradition. Eliot's 1947 British Council recording of *Four Quartets* is perhaps the most well known, and at that time certainly the most widely disseminated of his recordings, with *The Monthly Review of the British Council* from October 1947 reporting that Eliot's *Four Quartets* had been dispatched "to every Music Library of the Council".[442] Since the beginning of the War, and under the direction of Clinton-Baddeley, the British Council had been engaged in the recording of poetry on gramophone records "for export abroad, a cultural propaganda intended

---

[440] Grace, 11-12.

[441] These poems were recorded on May 22, 1942, and broadcast via the Swedish Broadcasting System on October 19, 1942. Copies of the recordings are held at the Sveriges Radio Archive. Although Eliot had read his poetry as part of a war effort prior to the April 1942 tour – having recited *East Coker* for the Eastern Service in May 1941 – the Swedish recordings predate the more well-known radio broadcasts for the BBC Eastern Service of "Burnt Norton" and "Dry Salvages", which were aired in October 1942, and the broadcast of "What the Thunder Said" as part of Orwell's *Voice* programme for the Eastern Service in December 1942.

[442] "Production Notes", *Monthly Review of the British Council* (October, 1947): 155.

to enable the people in other countries to hear English poetry and prose finely spoken".[443] What had begun at the beginning of the War as a rather solitary effort by Clinton-Baddeley, who had undertaken most of the poetry recordings himself, had evolved into an organized programme by 1947. The objective of the programme, according to Compton, was to build a library of recorded poetry and prose not only "notably interpreted", but which was also consummately professional. These recordings were to be "approved rendering[s]" with the "authenticity and freshness that mark an artistic performance", a professionalism that Compton and Clinton-Baddeley felt was decidedly lacking in the BBC.[444]

Although the Third Programme was beginning to acquire a reputation as the forerunner in cultural broadcasting in Britain by widening the availability of spoken poetry, gramophone records could comfortably compete by transferring control over the timing and frequency of these performances to the listener. Moreover, in a surprising attack on quality in the BBC – another self-proclaimed arbiter of high culture – Compton is scornful in his account of the caliber of speakers, the BBC's efforts having exposed "how few really accomplished speakers of poetry there are". Even professional broadcasters could find the process of recording for the gramophone an unsettling and alien experience. Indeed, Compton intimates that the absence of elocution and oral interpretation in the school and university curricula had led to a generation of otherwise literate individuals and academics "incapable of reading a passage of prose competently, or a poem tolerably".[445] Compton professed to be rigorous in his selection of speakers, standards to which the poets themselves were also subject, and no rendering of a poem – whether by a professional reciter of poetry or by the poet himself – should come at the expense of "departing from our standards".[446] These standards, however, themselves evolved out of an educational mandate attached to the programme that all members of society should be exposed to the oral rendering of poetry to mitigate against incomplete learning, "so that the ear is trained as well as his understanding". At stake, Compton thought, was more than the upholding of educational standards: access to poetry read aloud was essential in the

---

[443] J. Compton "A Library of Recorded English Literature" *Monthly Review of the British Council* (August, 1947): 75. Clinton-Baddeley most likely the actor and writer V. C. Clinton-Baddeley.
[444] Compton, 75.
[445] Compton, 75.
[446] Compton, 76.

holistic development of the "individual human creature". In what is, superficially, a similar conception of the memetic potential poetry espoused twenty years earlier in Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent", Compton understands a listener's awareness "of our heritage of poetry and prose" as comparable in value as the "loved thing in their homes".[447]

Yet an emphasis on recovering a tradition of oral recitation and preserving an oral soundbite of specific moments in the development of a poetic idiom had already been operational in the U.S for some time, likely providing the template for the Council's own initiative. Whilst the Council may have been the first of its kind in Britain to initiate a library of recordings predicated on the principles of intellectual development and preservation, programmes, underpinned by identical intellectual axioms, had been in place in America since the late 1920s. Indeed, the narrative of the next chapter focuses on Eliot's involvement in two such programmes at the University of Columbia and Harvard between 1932 and 1933, and it was through his participation in these oral preservation projects that the embryo for his criticism on cultural evolution was implanted. "Life is a change", he asserted in Hamburg in 1949, and "local areas must undergo the change just like the larger ones. But each area, each city, and each village should maintain their identity in this change. I cannot agree that the change and progress necessarily breeds uniformity".[448]

Unprecedented social change in America in the 1920s through both immigration and coordinated education curricula had threatened to efface the both the indigenous communities and races in America, whilst impacting on the perceived authenticity of local dialects. In response, anthropologists and linguists such as Franz Boas and William Cabell Greet at Columbia, and Frederick C. Packard at Harvard, established an agenda of preserving the voices of those communities even as they accepted the inevitability of cultural change. I have argued above that Eliot acknowledged the debt verse prosodists owed to their local communities in providing the components for a new verse idiom of the quotidian: in the discussion which follows, however, these localities signify more than a quarry of linguistic materials ripe for mining. Rather, they hold the mnemonic potential of a language, which, in constellation with other communities, forms the historic consciousness not only of the nation, but also of the poet's tradition on which he draws.

---

[447] Compton, 76.
[448] "Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft", 738.

Chapter Three: Laboratory Voices: Eliot and Recorded Poetry

Between September 1932 and May 1933, during his tenure as the Charles Eliot Norton Visiting Professor at Harvard, Eliot recorded his voice on a phonograph record on two separate occasions. However, these recordings were not intendeded for commercial distribution. Instead, the recordings Eliot undertook at both Harvard and the University of Columbia had their origins in a national linguistics project that sort to map the oral topography of dialects across the U.S. How the first of these series of recordings came about and the intellectual framework in which they took place is the subject of this chapter. Indeed, this explication should, I hope, help to provide a more comprehensive account of how Eliot, in the immediate aftermath of these recordings, came to hone his theory of vernacular prosody in the theatre, a theory that, as the previous chapter has shown, came to be woven into a socio-political understanding of the dissemination of culture that formed the backbone of his British Council lectures.

Eliot was not the first to bring Modernist poetics into the language laboratory. In 1913, Pound lent his voice to Pierre-Jean Rousselot's phonoscope as part of an experimental phonetics project at the Collège de France, during which Pound was convinced of the phonoscope's capacity to debunk those multifarious and malleable systems of prosody inherited from the nineteenth century, which were applied palimpsestically, and incongruously, to the real sounds of English.[449] Meanwhile, in 1929, James Joyce undertook a phonograph recording of a section of "Anna Livia Plurabelle" for the phoneticist C. K. Ogden within the remit of his Basic English Laboratory at Cambridge, a recording which, as we shall see, was given practical and commercial support by Eliot himself. Eliot's own sound recording for Greet, then, needs to be understood as an important intervention in Modernism's engagement with the science laboratory, where the literal Modernist voice was scrutinised within discourses of linguistics and anthropology, which in turn prioritised the somatic origins of the voice.

The laboratory origins of Greet's 1933 recordings of *The Waste Land* inevitably meant that they were never intended for commercial distribution, and, to date, Eliot's voice remains silenced by a medium intended to set it free. The

[449] See Michael Golston, *Rhythm and Race in Modernist Poetry and Science* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 64-72.

inaccessibility of this recording has meant that, with the exception of Richard Swigg's analysis of the recording, insufficient attention has been paid to Eliot's recordings as a fundamental constituent of his corpus.[450] This has been aggravated in part by an absence of a critical framework and vocabulary in which to discuss and interpret oral poetry.[451] Modernist poetry recordings were not merely leisurely accoutrements to the written text to be played on a device of the leisured, nor were they hypertextual material in the way that Eliot's *The Waste Land* notes or Faulkner's maps have been considered, but rather were interpretational instruments. They were, to borrow the tagline of Caedmon, Modernism's principal recording label, "The Third Dimension of the Printed Page."

But drawing attention to this archive of the voices of "Modernist" poets initiated by Greet inevitably highlights the assumptions prevailing at the time in literary scholarship of canonicity and race in respect to Modern poetry. Until twenty years ago, these assumptions were still very much prevailing, and not until the publication of such studies as North's *The Dialect of Modernism* (1994), Chip Rhodes's *Structures of the Jazz Age* (1998) or Carole Sweeney's *From Fetish to Subject* (2004) have these assumptions been not only challenged but overturned. More recently, Joshua L. Miller has investigated the concomitant development of a "standardized and racialized national vernacular" that was "racially stable" and the emergence of avant-garde movements within Modernist literature, both of which were stoked, he argues, by the same "radical energies" and conditions stimulated by mass immigration and its attendant growth of multilingual communities. Significant in Miller's account is the assertion that the standardizing movement – or what he defines as "English-only Americanism" – emblematized in H. L. Mencken's 1919 work *The American Language* should be understood as "one attempt to grapple with this complex set of relations".[452]

---

[450] See Richard Swigg, "Sound *The Waste Land*: T. S. Eliot's 1935 Recording" *PN Review* Vol. 28 No. 1 (September-October 2001). Swigg misdates this recording, however, as 1935. Eliot was not present in the U.S. in 1935, and the recording that Swigg deconstructs is that from 1933.

[451] In recent years, however, scholars have begun to reverse this trend. See, for example, Peter Middleton, *Distant Reading: Performance, Readership, and Consumption in Contemporary Poetry* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2005).; Derek Furr, *Recorded Poetry and Poetic Reception from Edna Millay to the Circle of Robert Lowell* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[452] Miller, 9.

Yet the linguistic landscape in the U.S. in during the 1920s and 1930s was by no means characterized by binary understandings of American and other, as Michael North has shown, with the intellectual establishment itself divided into those who subscribed to Menckian agenda of linguistic independence from England and those who wished to retain the "purity" of a language uncontaminated by the inevitable linguistic mixing associated with immigration.[453] For some Modernist poets, as Chip Rhodes has argued, those literary and linguistic cultures situated at the periphery of the accepted language norm, such as African American culture, provided "an idiom that seemed characteristically American and unsullied by European sources – the goal of modernists such as Williams and Marianne Moore whose search for a new linguistic register was part and parcel of their search for a distinctively American cultural identity".[454] For Carole Sweeney, meanwhile, those European avant-gardist movements such as Vorticism, Surrealism and Expressionism not only found in "modernist primitivism" the "dynamic and vigorous energies and contradictions of all the various strands of modernisms", but actively challenged the binary "fictions" that perpetuated the perception of racial and linguistic "centre and periphery": "certain forms of avant-garde modernism nurtured an emergent anticolonialism that was committed to a new poetics of race and difference and would challenge the authority of white mythologies".[455]

As this chapter will demonstrate, the dialect preservation projects and the poetry archive movements at Columbia and Harvard could conceivably be seen as reactions against those avant-gardist attempts to fertilize poetic language with what was considered to be un-American or alien dialects. Although Greet's poetry project sought to preserve the individual idioms and dialects of Modern poets, a crucial component in the preservation paradigm was actually a uniformity predicated on racial exclusion. Indeed, George Hibbitt, in soliciting the voices of Modern poets, devised a template letter that was careful to invite the poet into a community of like white voices. Writing, for example, to Conrad Aiken in January 1934, Hibbitt explains,

---

[453] North, 130.
[454] Chip Rhodes. *Structures of the Jazz Age. Mass culture, progressive education, and racial disclosures in American modernism* (London and New York: Verso, 1998), 171.
[455] Sweeney, 4; 7.

> [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[456]

What seems apparent almost immediately from this collection of names is not only the shared place these poets occupied in a racially exclusive Modern canon, but the disparate and metrically diverse range of voices that they possessed and in which they wrote.

Yet indicative of this reactionary movement away from multilingual and multiracial avant-gardist poetic practices was the recruitment of Vachel Lindsay as the first poet to record his voice for Columbia's archive. Those 1931 recordings by Lindsay conducted at Columbia show Lindsay, in "Flower Fed Buffaloes", for example, to be singing his poetry, using the full range and register of his voice, going beyond the "voiced" to the "sounded" in the way that he imitates instruments and employs onomatopoeia. Lindsay's musicality in his approach to poetry recitation may have been conducive to a technology largely associated with music reproduction, but Lindsay's strong reputation as a fashionable reciter of poetry was cultivated by his most famous, or infamous, of poems "The Congo: A Study of the Negro Race" which features among the recordings he made for Greet. Told in three parts, this "Study" moves the reader through the Congo from "Their Basic Savagery" in part one, to "Their Irrepressible High Spirits" in part two, to "The Hope of their Religion" in part three. One needn't have to listen Lindsay's own recitation to hear the racial mimicry in the syncopated jazz rhythms employed in the poem, and the fascination with the primitivist mythology of black identity and culture lies counter to the avant-garde embrace of African culture as an antidote to European hegemony. Instead the "Mumbo-Jumbo" of the "skull-faced witch-men" denies this black identity of a rational or even coherent idiom in which to express itself beyond a primitivist mythology.

Eliot was the second poet to record his work in one of the first oral poetry projects of its kind (Lindsay's recording was undertaken before Frederick Packard of the Harvard Vocarium had conceived of the idea) in a canon both glaringly white and predominantly male: Conrad Aiken (recorded 27th April, 1934); Padraic Colum (January 1935); Gertrude Stein (1935); John Erskine; John Gould Fletcher (1934); Robert Frost (November, 1934); Aldous Huxley; Alfred Kreymborg (March 1934);

---

[456] George Hibbitt to Conrad Aiken, letter, January, 1934, "George W. Hibbitt Correspondence", University of Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.

Edgar Lee Masters (March-April, 1934); George Russell (AE); James Stephens (December, 1935); and recitations by the actress Dame Sybil Thorndike. If Anita Patterson remonstrates against "the charge of elitist absolutism raised against Eliot by multiculturalists who regard him as a provincial, rigid apologist for a racially circumscribed canon of classic Western literature", this account of Eliot's involvement in Greet's collection will do little to arbitrate between those who insist on Eliot's provincialism and Patterson's insistence on Eliot's "awareness of hybridity, an awareness reflecting his own close knowledge of the frontier". Indeed, with the recordings coinciding with what Michael North has described as "his most notoriously narrow-minded opinions on race and culture" during his lectures at the University of Virginia, it is difficult to rehabilitate Eliot into a narrative of multicultural Modernism.

Although Eliot was noticeably hostile towards Lindsay's poetry, remarking in a letter to John Gould Fletcher in 1920 that he 'was appalled by [Vachel] Lindsay' who had published "The Broncho that would not be Broken" in *Chapbook* of that year, by 1935, Eliot's attitude towards Lindsay had softened.[457] This is evidenced by his correspondence to Michael Roberts, who was commissioned by Faber to put together an anthology of modern verse. In a letter to Roberts of July 1935, he concedes that Lindsay's poetry is [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], but that [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[458] Here, Eliot concedes a place in the canon for Linday's poetry, however begrudgingly, whilst giving some indication as to how he perceived his own position within Greet's hierarchical recording archive. Eliot's proposed re-admittance of Lindsay into Roberts's anthology confirms his place within a narrative of the cultural and national development of the American language advocated by certain factions of the intellectual establishment and, certainly at this point, by Eliot himself. Moreover, Eliot's earliest phonographic undertakings show him to be actively participating in a linguistics project that not only considered dialect to be a national and cultural artefact, but which also drew on anthropological disciplinary practices to archive America's voices. However, these particular recordings, I want to argue, also mark an intriguing and unique moment in the

[457] TSE to John Gould Fletcher, September 23, 1920, *Letters I*, 503.
[458] TSE to Michael Roberts, July 19, 1935, "Eliot, Thomas Stearns. 23 T. L. S. to Michael Roberts", File 2, Berg Collection, New York Public Library.

narrative of Eliot's criticism. Indeed, scholarly attention and exegesis has been concerned with the influence of anthropological discourses on Eliot's criticism and poetry for sixty years. Beginning with the unsympathetic analysis by the ethnologists A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn in 1954, who criticised his purported class-ridden definition of culture, to William Harmon, Adam Trexler, Caroline Patey, Susan Hegeman, and Marc Manganaro, all of whom have sought to trace the anthropological influences in play, as also Ron Bush has shown, from his teenage years through to his university education and beyond[459]. Inevitably, such accounts have largely been scaffolded on anthropological excavations of *The Waste Land*. Certainly, the poem appears to lend itself readily to an anthropological survey, itself being an archaeological site of mythologies, decaying cities and landscapes, which cling tenuously to the mnemonic voices of their inhabitants: it is a poem that at once lures the literary critic and cultural historian to wrestle with this layering of cultural and narratorial strata, whilst refusing to divulge a sequential and linear historical strata of cultural artefacts.

It is fitting, therefore, that it was *The Waste Land* that Eliot chose to recite for Greet, whose own intellectual proximity to Franz Boas, one of the founding-fathers not only of "modern" anthropology, but of the Columbia School of Anthropology, was, I will argue, central to the methodological practices he employed in building his archive of dialects. This chapter addresses how anthropological methodologies and axioms were integrated into a largely inchoate linguistic science, which was struggling to find credibility amongst the ruins of elocution, in the hope that exploring this synergetic relationship between Greet's and Boas's empirical approaches to language will elucidate more clearly the narrative of the origins and embryonic

---

[459] A very condensed but indicative list of critics attending to Eliot's anthropological investment include: William Harmon, "T. S. Eliot, Anthropologist and Primitive." *American Anthropologist* 78 (December, 1976): 797-811; Adam Trexler ,"Veiled Theory: The Transmutation of Anthropology in T. S. Eliot's Critical Method." *Paragraph* 29 (November 2006): 77-94; Caroline Patey, "Whose Tradition? T. S. Eliot and the Text of Anthropology" in *T. S. Eliot and the Concept of Tradition,* eds. Giovanni Cianci and Jason Harding. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 161-174; David Spurr, "Myths of Anthropology: Eliot, Joyce, Lévy-Bruhl." *PMLA* 109 (March 1994): 266-280; Ronald Bush, "The Presence of the Past: Ethnographic Thinking / Literary Politics," in *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism***,** eds. Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush (Stanford: University of Stanford Press, 1995); Marc Manganaro, *Myth, Rhetoric, and the Voice of Authority*: *A Critique of Frazer, Eliot, Frye, and Campbell*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

development of Eliot's own theoretical framework of culture that culminated in his *Notes Towards a Definition of Culture* in 1948.

Whilst Gail McDonald has argued that both Pound and Eliot employed the rhetoric of science to instil in their Modernist pedagogical paradigms an authentic professionalism, I will suggest that it was in practice and not exclusively in rhetoric that Eliot established a framework for culture.[460] In short, these recordings at Columbia were more than a mere nod to aural posterity: they signal a fundamental moment in the historical development of Eliot's cultural theory that engaged with anthropological *praxis* of archiving and collecting specimen voices. Eliot's recordings then, rather than being ancillary at best to his written works, were a fundamental part of his poetic and critical corpus, perhaps functioning as one of the best conduits possible between the two.

3.1 From the Radio to the Phonograph

The question that inevitably arises when discussing Eliot's phonographic recordings of his poems is that of his choice of medium. Fresh from the BBC delivering "Tonic Talks… to foment the cause of Adult Edjjication", Eliot had established himself as a trusted literary critic and social commentator on the British airwaves "with an audience far larger than any to which he previously had or desired access."[461] He was, as Todd Avery asserts, "circumspect" of radio as a means of broadcasting poetry, although exactly why this was the case has not, up until this point, been satisfactorily explained. I would like here to suggest some factors that drove Eliot's privileging of the phonograph as the optimal means of transmission of his poetry.

The first relates to his reticence over the commercial, and therefore unrestrained and uncontrolled, access to his poetry and recitation voice. Although the final chapter of this thesis addresses in greater detail Eliot's longstanding concerns over the copyright of his speaking voice, it is pertinent to note here that the 1928 Rome amendment to the Berne Convention provided only minimal protection to authors and the broadcasting of their works. Whilst authors retained the right to sanction the broadcast of the written work itself, the Convention was suitably vague

---

[460] Gail McDonald, *Learning to be Modern: Pound, Eliot, and the American University* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993): 77.
[461] TSE to Bonamy Dobrée, July 4, 1929, *Letters IV*, 534-5; Avery, 116-117.

enough to leave it to individual institutions to negotiate the terms of ownership post-broadcast. Indeed, the BBC's twenty-eight-day policy, whereby it could hold copyright for that period and reprint broadcasts within its magazine *The Listener,* made authors vulnerable not only to copyright infringement but also to the judgment of readers unfamiliar with a particular author's canon or critical precedent. In contrast, the potential of the phonograph to protect the author from such infringement was, for its inventor Thomas Edison, one of its key benefits. In his 1888 article "The Perfected Phonograph", he extols the phonograph's ability to allow authors to "publish their novels or essays exclusively in phonogram form, so as to talk to their *readers* personally; and in this way they can protect their works from being stolen by means of defective copyright laws" (italics added).[462] Eliot's own position on copyright and the fees he demanded for the broadcast of his poetry, moreover, could often be a cause of friction between his publishers, Faber and Faber, and the BBC. Indeed, an internal memo from October 1938 reveals that the Programme Copyright Section were having difficulties obtaining the rights from Faber for Eliot's poetry on account of the copyright fees that they were demanding. Although Faber appeared to eventually approach a more "reasonable" position, and so easing the way for Eliot's poetry to appear on air, there was nevertheless still resistence from Eliot himself, who could be [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].The BBC's strident uniformity on the issue of fees, however, was not to be undermined, they determined, by Eliot himself, and although Eliot's poetry was now available for consideration, his poetry was by no means to be thought indispensable to programming or immune from being dropped entirely: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[463]

Yet, Edison's notion that copyright should be contingent on the "intimate" relationship established between author and reader was one that, forty years later, was actually being used by Eliot as an argument *against* the suitability of radio as a platform for poetry. This respect for the author's property, predicated as it was on an assumed intimacy between author and "reader," provided another reason for Eliot's reluctance to premiere his work on the radio. Frank Kendon in "Poetry and

---

[462] Thomas A. Edison, "The Perfected Phonograph." *The North American Review* 146 (June 1888): 647.
[463] D.F.D to A.C, memo "T.S. ELIOT." , October 7, 1938, "R Conc 1. Eliot, T. S. Scriptwriter: 1935-68", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

Broadcasting", published in *The Radio Times* in July 1929 just as Eliot's first series of lectures for the BBC were in production, stressed the vulnerability required of the listener to be effectively receptive to poetry, an act of "surrender…as offensive to most people as undressing in public would be." Poetry, as opposed to criticism or drama, is unique in that

> Nobody can read poetry at all times; it needs a certain frame of mind, a quietness that is not weariness; and this is where broadcast poetry often fails. It must fail with some listeners – some are never in that frame of mind at all, others not at the moment. Something, perhaps, may be done to create it, by making the reading the climax of a carefully planned period not interrupted by announcements, or by an account of the setting or the events which led up to, and partly explain, the poem. There is nothing worse than having poetry thrust upon you when you are unready.[464]

Eliot's own orchestration of the reception of his work is defined by a degree of territorialism and protectionism that has continued to this day, and scholars have largely tended to argue, with good reason, for his utilisation of his criticism to self-manage the response and interpretation of his poetry.

Nevertheless, the reasons behind his reluctance to use the radio to transmit his verse not only echo those misgivings of Kendon above, but suggest that the very democracy of radio – its availability to an audience not only unfamiliar with the poet but with poetry in general, or to those from a wide spectrum of educational backgrounds – was itself inimical to the transmission of the poet's (or at least Eliot's) work. Indeed, it was radio's very accessibility that, ironically, made it an unsuitable medium for educating a public on poetry, as one letter to Judith Wogan in December 1929 makes clear:

> My objection to 'repertory' for a poem (not for plays, where of course I approve) is that it may introduce poems to people who are unprepared for them, and also that it stamps a writer as an [*bottom edge of page has been torn off*] and perhaps not one by which he cares to be so judged.[465]

Edison's unintended synecdoche, where reader and listener become fused, plays a central part in Eliot's conception of the aural reception of his work. Where the radio's

---

[464] Frank Kendon "Poetry and Broadcasting" *The Radio Times* Vol. 24 (July 5, 1929): 1, 8.
[465] TSE to Judith Wogan, December 9, 1929, *Letters IV,* 701.

very accessibility allowed listeners to tune in at will at any point throughout a broadcast, phonograph recordings, in contrast, relied on a more scrupulous degree of agency, or, more specifically, on pre-meditated and prepared listening. Although, as Michael Coyle has argued, Eliot's criticism benefitted from radio's capacity to "project pure voice – speech unmediated by writing", the oral reception of poetry required greater textual foresight.[466] In short, Eliot is here directing us to the fact that the written text of the poem is prior to its oral rendering. Writing in *The Use of Poetry and the Use Criticism*, the published lectures he delivered at Harvard between 1932 and 1933, he cautions those "untrained readers" who rely on "the sham or the adulterate article" to dictate taste and reading practices. Readers, instead, needed to take the responsibility upon themselves to cultivate a critical approach that could "organise" their experiences of "good" poems into a holistic understanding of taste. Eliot's notion of a trained reader, however, is more akin to an accomplished editor, the pinnacle of critical attainment being not the distinction between "good" and "bad' poetry, but the "ability to select a good *new* poem, to respond properly to a new situation."[467]

It is no coincidence, therefore, that, with the exception of his 1956 Caedmon recordings, all of Eliot's recordings would be conducted under the auspices of educational or cultural institutions such as those at Harvard and Columbia between 1932 and 1933, and the British Council and the Library of Congress in the 1940s and 1950s.[468] From this we can gather that such recordings were intended for listeners who were more likely to have had prior knowledge and acquaintance with the *written*

---

[466] Michael Coyle, "T. S. Eliot on the Air: 'Culture' and the Challenges of Mass Commmunication," in *T. S. Eliot and Our Turning World*, ed. Jewel Spears Brooker (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001),144.

[467] Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1964), 18-19. Hereafter *UPUC*.

[468] Even the Caedmon recordings were not intended for "popular" use but rather for an educated and cultured class of listener. As one *New York Times* reporter explained in 1956: "One thing these Caedmon records are bound to do and that is to alter the course of future scholarship. A hundred years from now, no Ph.D. candidate will dare to be without his hi-fi set, and critics of the future (Freudian, New and semantic) will have a high time pondering slurred words, dropped lines and changed rhythms. And the House of Caedmon will rank with the Domesday Book and the Exchequer Rolls of the Middle Ages as prime source material for doctoral theses." See *New York Times* (June 24, 1956): X8. A comprehensive list of the recordings Eliot undertook throughout his lifetime will be published in the forthcoming *Collected Poems* (Faber and Faber, 2015).

work. Moreover, the unintentional ellipsis present in the letter, whereby we might speculatively fill in the gap, fitfully demonstrates Eliot's unease regarding the extent to which he might forfeit control over his public image. Further correspondence from the year of his first broadcasts reveal, moreover, a definite anxiety that a public performance of his poetry would relinquish any control over *who* would receive his work, *how* it would be transformed in action during the performance by the speaker, and the uncertainty of the fate of the poem once appropriated, and possibly further transmuted, by the audience themselves. Actors, he knew as early as 1920, had a tendency to go beyond merely "transmitting" the lines, the temptation to "interpret" dealing what he considered to be a fatal blow to the integrity of the author's verse.[469] Responding to one request to undertake a poetry recital of his work, Eliot makes it quite clear that a poetry reading, even of another poet's work, had to be augmented by a "critical comment," an exercise he reluctantly though not infrequently undertook at Harold Monro's Poetry Bookshop.[470] Monro's Poetry Bookshop, as with the recording laboratories of Harvard and Columbia, provided an educational demographic that was not only receptive to, but by virtue of their attentive listening, invested in the rhythms of the Modernist project.

Institutional phonograph recordings made by Eliot himself guaranteed not only an intellectually prepared audience, however, but also a retention of copyright of both the written and recorded work, as well as control over the final "form" of the recording. The fact that Eliot's recordings for Columbia and Harvard were never intended for commercial distribution meant that legal restrictions regarding censorship could never be enforced. Certainly by 1933 literary Modernism had established its own legal legacy in terms of censorship, with Eliot being actively engaged in the opposition towards legal action taken against *Ulysses*, *Cantleman's Spring Mate*, and, more recently, Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness*. If such episodes in Modernism's early history were to serve as cautionary tales for printed media, Eliot would be ultimately correct in being wary of the radio censors and their proclivity for editing. In 1937, in a move that must surely have recalled to Eliot his dismay with *Poetry*'s unauthorised excision of "foetus" in "Mr. Apollynax", the BBC's own "edited" production of *The Waste Land*, in which references to abortion

---

[469] See "'The Duchess of Malfi' at the Lyric: and Poetic Drama." *Art & Letters* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1920): 36-39.
[470] TSE to Ursula Roberts, May 8, 1929, *Letters IV,* 492.

and sexual encounters were silently expunged, left Eliot politely livid. Broadcast for the "Experimental Hour", the BBC were forced to issue a written apology to Eliot for the "necessary" cutting of the poem, an act deemed [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. That the BBC hoped that Eliot would agree that the broadcast of the poem, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], would be preferable to no performance at all underestimated Eliot's determination to manage the aural "form" of his poetry: no other "interpretation" of *The Waste Land* was to be offered on the radio, and Eliot would, in future, exercise considerable control over his radio poetry corpus and the selection of performers.[471]

Nevertheless, this was not an easy transition. Although the BBC had responded positively to his radio talks, Eliot was still reticent about performing his poetry in public, writing to his mother in 1929 that radio itself was a preferable medium to the live performance, which attracted those who merely "come to see what you look like."[472] The years between 1929 and 1932, therefore, form a period during which Eliot started to craft this recitation technique in preparation for committing his voice permanently to record. "I dislike more than anything reading my own poems," he wrote to Ursula Roberts in May 1929, and there are no records to suggest that he undertook any poetry recitals during 1929, with only two taking place in 1930.[473] As Michael Coyle and others have pointed out, Eliot was attentive to the way that different methods of speaking – whether broadcasts, lectures or recitals – demanded different formal approaches. So too, as letters in *The Radio Times* and *The Listener* demonstrate, were the listeners and public themselves, who invariably took the time to write in and critique the voices welcomed into their domestic space. Unsurprisingly, this had an effect on Eliot's desire to cultivate a voice that would be immune from such criticism. Speaking at Columbia almost exactly twenty-five years after his first recording for Greet in May 1933, Eliot draws attention to the phonograph's demand for perfection:

---

[471] Unknown correspondent to TSE, letter, January 11, 1938, "R Conc 1. Eliot, T. S. Scriptwriter: 1935-68", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[472] TSE to his mother, July 28, 1929, *Letters* IV, 554. Eliot's ambivalence regarding public image and celebrity would continue throughout his career, and indeed in his 1948 Nobel Prize acceptance speech he opens by expressing his gratitude as well as "exasperation at the inconvenience, of being turned overnight into a public figure." See Eliot's "T.S. Eliot - Banquet Speech".
[473] TSE to Ursula Roberts, May 8, 1929 *Letters IV*, 492.

> In the first place, when you're making a gramophone record, you are very much on edge to avoid slips. Your chief anxiety is not to do anything wrong, whereas when you're reading direct to an audience, you're not worrying so much about making slips or doing something wrong, but you're anxious to get something positively right. A gramophone record may have no mistakes in it, but at the same time the anxiety to avoid mistakes rather prevents one from expanding as one sometimes does in front of an appreciative audience. The other reason is that I've found it impossible to do recording for more than twenty minutes at a time, because the strain is so great in recording that fatigue in the voice begins to show after that time. Therefore, a gramophone recording such as I make is made up of sections which are put together; having made the sections myself, I can often detect the joints where I left off one day and began another day, perhaps halfway through a poem. When one is reading to an audience one may make mistakes and they don't matter, but one has the opportunity of occasionally rising to one's very best, an opportunity one hasn't in recording.[474]

Clearly, over twenty-five years and a substantial audio corpus later, Eliot had concluded that the phonograph was inhibitive to the spontaneous potential of the poetry reading, as well as to the integrity of the formal structure of the poem itself. Only in 1958, and not before having become one of the most recorded Modernists, would he prove to support Sebastian D. G. Knowles's later assertion that the gramophone was anathema to him because "Modernism insists on live performance."[475] Evident here, too, is the physical demands placed on the voice by the gramophone, the technological shortcomings of which meant that speakers had to be alert to the volume, intonational register, and consistency of their speaking voices, which was both physically and mentally exhausting. By 1958, this exhaustion was no doubt exacerbated by Eliot's long battle with emphysema, but this unique insight offered by Eliot's into the recording process illuminates how the joints of a recording – technological and verbal – necessarily troubled the seamlessness of the poetry and the voice.

---

[474] Eliot, "T. S. Eliot talks about his poetry," *Columbia University Forum* (Fall 1958), 14.

[475] Sebastian D. G. Knowles, "Death by Gramophone" *Journal of Modern Literature*, Vol. 27 (Fall 2003): 9.

3.2 Recording Mr. Joyce

Three years before Eliot began to officially establish a scholarly canon of recorded works he was taking a keen, *invested*, interest in the phonograph as a means of cultural dissemination, particularly for the advancement of Modernist poets and authors. Yet it was in Cambridge, rather than at Harvard or Columbia, where the narrative might begin to unfold, where we can isolate the point at which Eliot began to regard recordings as autonomous texts in themselves worthy of study – as documentary accounts, specimens, of a specific *linguistic* moment in the history of English literature.

Indeed, in 1929, Sylvia Beach solicited the help of the linguist C. K. Ogden to record James Joyce reading "Anna Livia Plurabelle". Ogden, whose London-based Orthological Institute boasted two of the world's largest and most advanced recording machines, agreed to direct the recording for Joyce whose eyesight was rapidly failing and who would have trouble, even then, reading from the text. If Joyce was engaged in an experiment in linguistics, exploring the dialectic between linguistic universalism and localism, persistently recovering and expanding the idiom, the Orthological Institute was largely dedicated to the research into Ogden's own linguistic experiment, which sought to prioritise and limit the lexicon and its grammatical structures. This laboratory-born language, as Ogden's colleague I. A. Richards would explain, comprised of a mere 850 words, regulated by a restricted grammatical and idiomatic system that could limit their range of meanings. With foundations built on the rather unsteady, if not polemical ground, of so-called "standard-usage", Ogden's was a contrived "all-purpose" language that could, in theory, be spoken easily by natives and non-natives alike for the purposes of "trade, commerce, science, general knowledge, and the discussion at simple levels of all the common affairs of man".[476] Anxious to prove the universal applicability of the language, Ogden took to "translating" *Anna Livia* into Basic English, appearing in *transition* in 1932.[477]

---

[476] I. A. Richards, "Basic English and its Applications," in *C. K. Ogden and Linguistics*. Vol. 1., ed. W. Terrence Gordon (London: Routledge/Thoemmes Press, 1994), 16.

[477] C. K. Ogden, "James Joyce's Anna Livia Plurabelle in Basic English," *transition* 21 (March, 1932): 259-262.

Joyce's own constructed and idiolectic language, however, did not yield readily to translation, and Ogden found himself dependent on the recording as a legend to what Eliot called that "monstrous masterpiece of merely beautiful nonsense": Joyce's recording, then, took the rather unexpected role of interpreter, its capacity to elucidate on the written text facilitating the embryonic form of literary criticism known as oral interpretation, a practice being widely taught across universities particularly in the U.S., notably at Harvard by the professor of speech Frederick C. Packard, the founder of the Harvard Vocarium.[478]

Yet it is how Eliot intercedes in this moment of recorded history that provides an intriguing inroad into the narrative of the beginnings of his own first recordings, which took place nearly four years later in 1933. Having been instrumental in securing Faber's publication of "Anna Livia" and "Haveth Childers", and eventually, the *Wak*e in its entirety, Eliot wrote to Ogden in April of 1930 for clarification of a verbal agreement to publicise the recording of Anna Livia alongside the publication of the pamphlet:

> First are you dealing with these records yourself or does H.M.V. take any responsibility for them. The point is that I feel that H.M.V. ought to pay us for the printing and insertion of such a slip. In this case you will understand that there is no reciprocal advertisement to be gained: the slip may help to sell the record but unless H.M.V. do some advertising on their own**,** the record will not help to sell the pamphlet.[479]

Clearly apparent from this letter is Eliot's uncertainty regarding the commercial value of the recording. Although there was a third "imprint" of the recording made, sales were disappointing. Whilst a commercial gramophone market was flourishing in Britain, particularly the Gramophone Company and Columbia Records, which merged in 1931 as EMI, such companies were primarily interested in the production of musical discs which were naturally more economically viable than literary recordings. But if commercial gain wasn't the objective here, what sort of vested interest did Eliot have in promoting Joyce's voice? The most obvious answer, of course, would be that Eliot simply appreciated the beauty of the work, and that the record would provide a

---

[478] Eliot, "The Frontiers of Criticism." *The Sewanee Review* 64, no. 4 (October-December, 1956), 532.
[479] TSE to C. K. Ogden, April 11, 1930, *Letters V*, 142.

neat companion to the text for the avid Joyce fan and recoup at least some of the costs for the storage and packaging of the discs.

But this answer might also be the most dubious given Eliot's equivocatory position over the artistic merit of the *Wake* as a whole. Nowhere is this more palpable than in Eliot's declining of the invitation from Jack P. Dalton in 1963 to contribute to a collection of essays on the twenty-fifth Anniversary of the *Wake'*s publication, explaining that "[i]t is true that I was responsible for the publication of FINNEGANS WAKE but I never felt any warm enthusiasm for the work…all one can say is that after *Ulysses* there was nothing else for him to do".[480] But if Eliot was later dismissive of the *Wake*'s "charms", describing it in his 1956 Minnesota lecture, as a "monstrous masterpiece of merely beautiful nonsense", he was cognisant of the gramophone's potential to release the prosodic cadences of the text.[481] More particularly he understood the gramophone's capacity to not only expose the prosodic and rhythmic elements of voice in the novel, but also that this exposure was instantaneous: the gramophone voiced the text from the inside-out. Listening to the record, Eliot found, "revealed at once a beauty which is *disclosed only gradually by the printed page*" (emphasis added).[482] The gramophone record was more than merely Joyce's voice turned spectacle: it transformed the seemingly impenetrable, idiolectic prose, into a "vast prose poem… which every student of poetry ought to read", and in voicing those submerged rhythms excavated the poetic form of the piece from beneath what appeared to be mere verbal rubble. It needed, he insisted, to be

> read aloud, preferably by an Irish voice; and, as the one gramophone record which *we* made attests, no other voice could read it, not even another Irish voice, as well as Joyce could read it himself. This is a limitation which has made more slow the appreciation and enjoyment of his last book.[483]

The title of the radio programme from which the above is extracted, "The Approach to James Joyce", colludes in an holistic system of interpretation from which close listening is not excluded or appended. Even as late as 1956, Eliot still positions himself closely to the production of the record as much as he is distancing himself

---

[480] Jack P. Dalton. "A Letter from T. S. Eliot." *James Joyce Quarterly* 6, no. 1 (Fall, 1968): 80-81.
[481] Eliot, "The Frontiers of Criticism", 532.
[482] T. S. Eliot. "The Approach to James Joyce." *The Listener* Vol. 30, No. 770 (October 14, 1943), 446
[483] Eliot, "The Approach to James Joyce", 446.

from the position that traditional exegesis can expose the sense of the text as prose. Like Ogden, Eliot envisioned the record as a critical tool that was fundamentally elucidatory, and which, importantly, signalled the need for a new type of critic – the reader-listener compound – who could develop a new language by which to narrate this bi-sensory method of interpretation. Where this new language might be crafted, however, was still uncertain. Perhaps, as Eliot originally thought in 1930, what was needed was a gramophone equivalent of a bookclub, "a Society," he suggests to Herbert Gorman, of around 25 people who could commit themselves to buying a record at regular intervals throughout the year at a set price. Although Eliot anticipated that the audience for a quarterly gramophone club would be comparatively small ("at least 50 persons") and financially elite, he proposed the institution of a "respectable" Editorial Board to lend professional, cultural and economic legitimacy to the project.[484] Envisioned here, too, is a rather more parochial notion of what he terms "noted authors" – comprised of Yeats, Woolf and Joyce to begin with – which suggests in turn a target demographic for whom the authors themselves had cultural and oral currency, and, importantly, who had encountered their textual works, and therefore presuming an educated listenership.

Yet Eliot also recognised that if the phonograph was to be considered a key medium for marketing Modernism, it needed to be relieved of its middle-brow affiliation with popular culture. As Eliot was beginning to tentatively negotiate the transition of his poetry from the private sphere of textual exegesis on the part of the reader to oral performance, what was becoming increasingly clear during these years was the development of a theory of performance of poetry that was grounded in intellectual endeavour, as opposed to spectacle, which required a mechanical means of transmission that could accommodate this level of interpretative ability.

The socially restrictive nature of the phonograph, where by virtue of its status as a luxury leisure device, which was limited to educational institutions and excluded the less affluent, mitigated the potential of [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Neither of the recordings undertaken at Harvard or Columbia were for commercial sale, and the pedagogical utility of the recordings

[484] TSE to Herbert Gorman, October 14, 1930, *Letters V*, 342.

ensured that Eliot, to quote Vocarium-founder Frederick C. Packard, was speaking to [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[485]

Plans for Eliot's proposed Gramophone Society never left the ground, and it couldn't have come as too much of a surprise later that, despite Eliot's efforts, Joyce's record had very disappointing sales. Yet this also seemed to confirm the uneasy cooperation between publishers and those involved in the oral dissemination of poetry, such as the BBC and gramophone companies. With publishers experiencing ever declining sales in poetry, there was a level of distrust over how responsible these oral platforms were for corroding the market value of the printed text. "The camera, the gramophone, the wireless bring new problems to disturb an atmosphere which the growing sympathy and fellow-dealing between publisher and author had done much to render serene", was the consensus at the 1936 Empire Press Union Conference.[486] Meanwhile, concerns over the financial ramifications over the technological developments in "talking books", portended imminent copyright encroachment, and emanated directly out of Eliot's firm Faber and Faber, with Geoffrey Faber himself warning that "[t]he first books to be exploited would be non-copyright books, but the copyright field would soon be invaded".[487]

Naturally gramophone records were more expensive to produce with a larger number of vested interests so that, even with the agreed 10% royalty that usually accompanied Eliot's contractual obligations for recordings, the profits would be rather thinly spread. Indeed, sales of his Harvard Vocarium recordings must have seemed rather disappointing from the perspective of a seasoned publisher, but in comparative terms the figures were actually rather remarkable. Harvard only began "publishing" their recordings in 1948, and their figures show that between July of that year and June 1949, a total of 2565 discs were sold, of which sales of T. S. Eliot records

---

[485] Frederick C. Packard, "'Voiced' Literature, in School, Church, Home." [1940s?], manuscript in private collection. In a 1967 student handbook from the University of Columbia, which advertises the holdings of the Speech Recordings Library, the pedagogical utility of the recordings is stressed: 'Recordings circulate only to faculty members for teaching purposes. Students are provided with facilities for listening, under supervision, from 11 to 5, Monday through Friday, in 412 Memorial Library.' See "Galley proof (no.19) of University Student Handbook" (Second Proof), 1967, "Copy-Unive. Bulletins & Guides", Box 2 "Columbia Theatre Productions To Correspondence, 1953". Columbia University Brander Matthews Dramatic Museum Collection.

[486] "Publishers in Conference" *The Times*, June 9, 1936.

[487] "Talking Books" *The Times*, June 10, 1936.

constituted 1245.[488] This, of course, was a bonanza year given Eliot's Nobel Prizeaward, which must to some extent have accounted for the impressive comparative figures. Although sales would gradually dwindle, Eliot's recordings would continue to constitute a significant percentage of the overall figures until the mid 1950s. But if the market value was insufficient impetus to record, over twenty years after the original Harvard and Columbia recordings Eliot could still identify the cultural and pedagogical utility of the archived recording, a value that was firmly linked with his notion of the poet's obligation to *preserve*. Furthermore, with the quest to find an audience who could invest in Modernist recordings the requisite value necessary for their establishment both as autonomous aesthetic texts in their own right, and also as critical compendiums to their written counterparts, Eliot would need to go back to the language laboratory where Joyce had also begun, not in the British, but in the American university

The intimacy of the phonograph, however, that could speak only to "50 persons" within the privacy of one's home was a plausible medium for Eliot who, in those early years, was still reticent about public readings of his poetry and of delivering lectures. "I never speak in public when I can help it", he wrote to John Gould Fletcher in 1928, but a phonograph recording he considered an intimate process perfect, he jokes, for profitable spirituality: "It reminds me of my own idea for making money: that is, to make gramophone prayer records to be fitted to electrical gramophones to be sold in Thibet. I believe there is plenty of water in Thibet, so there ought to be no difficulty about the electricity. There should be millions in it".[489] Between October 1932 and the Summer of 1933, however, Eliot's voice was spurred into a sudden increase in productivity, undertaking at least fourteen separate recitals that, like his recordings, were restricted to educational, literary or religious institutions.[490] During the 1950s, particularly after his second marriage, the poetry reading was one of the most lucrative arms of Eliot's career, commanding as much as $2500 for a single reading, which would frequently go towards financing his

---

[488] Josephine Packard, "A Discography of the Harvard Vocarium." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 15, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter, 2005), 126.
[489] TSE to John Gould Fletcher, March 6, 1928, *Letters IV*, 86.
[490] Including at Wellesely College in October 1932; at UCLA and the University of California, Berkeley in January 1933; at Chicago, in support of *Poetry* magazine, in January 1933; at Brown University, Yale and the Blackstick Literary Society in February 1933; the New School for Social Research, New York in April 1933; and Vassar in May 1933.

trips to the States.[491] This early increase in recitative output is remarkable not only because it coincided with the period during which he made his first phonograph recordings, but also because they took place exclusively within the United States. Whilst a commercial phonographic market dominated by the Gramophone Company and Columbia was flourishing in Britain, Eliot's conscious decision to record both in *America* and within the academic institution suggests an affinity between place and poetic voice.[492] More precisely, it demonstrated Eliot's willingness to participate in a uniquely American cultural programme, at the heart of which was the poet's voice.

3.3 Canning the Voice at Harvard

Crucial to the narrative of Eliot's transition from radio to phonograph, is the due attention paid by Eliot to the voice itself. By the time Eliot made his first phonographic recording at Harvard in 1932, his professional speaking career was still in its infancy. Despite having been invited back to the BBC in 1930 for a second series of six lectures on "Seventeenth Century Poetry," Eliot was still uncertain enough about the quality of his speaking voice to write to the Director of Talks, C. A. Siepmann, that [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Indeed, Eliot's nervous attentiveness to the radio voice was frequently reconstituted into the observation of the voices of fellow broadcasters. Writing to Siepmann only a year later in November 1931, Eliot was cautiously offering criticism of the delivery of other broadcasters, particularly one who had a tendency [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Bold as this judgment might have seemed, it was nevertheless modified by a degree of insecurity: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[493]

By 1936, however, Eliot's attitude towards voice testing, of having his voice assessed within a BBC paradigm of spoken English, had shifted. In July 1936, George

---

[491] Robert Giroux to TSE, letter, August 6, 1957, "Eliot, T. S. On Poetry and Poets. Correspondence 1955-1958", Farrar, Straus & Giroux, Inc. Records. Box 98, The New York Public Library Manuscripts and Archives Division.

[492] See D. L. Mahieu, *The Rise of Modern Commercial Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 13-14. LeMahieu notes that Columbia and the Gramophone Company merged in 1931 to become one of the largest recording companies still in existence, EMI. Of course, such companies were primarily interested in the production of musical records, which would prove more economically viable than literary recordings.

[493] TSE to C. A. Siepmann, 16 November, 1931, *Letters VI, 739.*

Barnes invited Eliot to select a number of poems [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Eliot, whilst agreeing somewhat reluctantly to undertake the work, appears to have taken considerable offence to the closing sentence in Barnes's letter: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[494] Eliot's response indicates that he had considered himself as having acquired if not a status, then at least a reputation, at the BBC, concluding somewhat churlishly, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[495] Although Eliot's professional reputation as a literary critic, and now dramatist, had taken an upward turn in that year, what had precipitated the resistance to vocal assessment and prescription was, I would argue, a result of the recordings undertaken at Harvard and Columbia.

In May 1933, Eliot wrote to Frank Morley in some excitement, having heard his voice played back to him for the first time at Columbia [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[496] This newfound self-confidence clearly had an impact on his relationship to the BBC, especially in terms of the supposed novice at the microphone. I might suggest, moreover, that it was the linguistic experiments taking place at both Harvard and Columbia that informed his resistance to voice testing at all. Whilst Eliot undertook his Charles Eliot Norton Lectures at Harvard, Frederick Packard, evidently influenced by the work of Greet, was busy "Canning the Harvard Accent" in a bid to identify, and ultimately cultivate, a distinctly Harvard accent. Freshmen would record their voices on entry to the University and so add to what he thought would be "a most interesting scientific collection…[in which] all the characteristics of the student's speech will be permanently recorded". Where at Columbia Greet was operating out of an already established anthropological framework for investigation, Packard's one-man band experiment was decidedly more parochial, but his objectives were no less ambitious, attempting, like Columbia, to draw a so-called "phonetic atlas". "Each year students come to Harvard from every State of the Union" and Packard envisaged a hundred

---

[494] George Barnes to T. S. Eliot, letter, July 30, 1936, "T.S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[495] T. S. Eliot to George Barnes, letter, August 14, 1936, "Rcont 1. Eliot, T. S. Talks File 2. 1938-1943", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[496] TSE to Frank Morley, letter, May 3, 1933 "Outgoing correspondence" [Frank Morley], Berg Collection, New York Public Library.

years from then, the historian would have "a permanent record to aid him and will listen to the voices of the past as they really sounded".[497]

But it was in establishing an archive of poet's voices as a cultural, and a distinctly national impetus for preservation, that Packard would be most successful and most devoted, for, as he states at the end of an unpublished radio lecture, in the Vocarium, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[498] In this broadcast, entitled "Voiced Literature in School, Church and Home," Packard not only expands on the notion that an informed exegesis is possible only by a critic with "a trained ear", but on the contingent relationship between the critical practice of listening and the preservationist potential of the phonograph disc itself: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Indeed, the Vocarium design itself reflected this contingency, and in a 1949 retrospective of its history, Packard stresses the necessary physical proximity of the printed and the "talking book" which [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Certainly, if Vocarium figures are anything to go by, students were immensely receptive to the critical and pedagogical potential of the phonograph disc, with over 4000 students using the purpose-built Vocarium in a 4 month period in 1949.[499]

Packard's programme to preserve the poet's voice evidently chimed with Eliot as a publisher, when four months after having made the recording at Harvard, and now back in England, Eliot approached Packard to suggest that Faber organise the British publication of the catalogue of records being amassed under the Vocarium. This obviously didn't come to fruition, but Eliot encouraged Packard to communicate with Greet, and in doing so was giving some sort of sanction to the network of recordings that would emerge across Columbia, Harvard, Chicago and Pennsylvania, to name just the larger archives, who would cooperate in a shared, material paradigm of a specifically Modernist dialect that could only be heard, like Joyce's records, both in an oral rendering and, importantly, adjacent to each other.

Cultivating a recitation voice, moreover, would signal an important change in Eliot's conception of the dynamics of professional authorship, suggesting that

---

[497] "Canning the Harvard Accent" *Daily Boston Globe*, December 31, 1933.
[498] Frederick C. Packard, "'Voiced' Literature, in School, Church, Home." [1940s?], manuscript in private collection.
[499] Frederick C. Packard. "Book and Disc Savored Together." [1949?], manuscript in private collection.

recorded, and what he would later refer to as [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], would be a fundamental constituent of his holistic notion of authorship that incorporated both the voice and the printed word. Eliot's phonograph recordings would also prove beneficial in his later work for the BBC. Indeed, for Ian Cox, a BBC producer, Eliot's Harvard phonograph recordings of "Gerontion" and "The Hollow Men" (a copy of which had been given to the BBC actor and correspondent Geoffrey Tandy) were educational materials for the producers themselves. Cox's concern with how a producer might read the "[This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] of the written text of a poem could, he believed, provide insight into their timings; but his letter to Eliot reveals the spatial tensions between radio and the phonograph. In listening to the recordings, Cox expects Eliot to abide by a deliberate and accurate oral rendering of the poem according to a fixed system of notation. The sequence of pauses that he identifies to mark the end of one line and beginning of another in the recordings, [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] is upset by what he sees as Eliot's inconsistent use of pauses in fourteen instances in "Gerontion" and "The Hollow Men."

Radio's determination to contractually bind the text, as a system of notation, to the voice disallows for the spontaneity that Eliot later felt should accompany an unrecorded and unbroadcast recital, and Cox's lament that [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] prioritises, for radio, the voice's subservience to the text.[500] Temporal limitations were also at the forefront of Eliot's mind in 1936 when, in a letter to Director of Talks George Barnes regarding a programme on "Vaughan, Herbert and Crashaw", he was asked to select poems for a fifteen-minute slot. Reluctant, even resentful, of having to undergo another voice test – [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] – Eliot dispels Cox's assumption that poetic "notation" could establish a uniform tempo of recitation: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons][501]

---

[500] Cox to TSE, letter, January 16, 1939, "Rcont 1. Eliot, T. S. Talks File 2. 1938-1943", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[501] TSE to George Barnes, letter, August 14, 1936, "T.S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

Yet, as evident from his comment on Dawson's broadcast voice quoted above, Eliot was attentive to the pauses of and the lengths employed by the speakers themselves, whilst his letter to Barnes suggests that there is a greater degree of agency on the part of the reader to interpret the pace of the prosodic line. In asserting as much, Eliot was dismantling the tradition of prosody established by poets such as E. H. Dallas and Coventry Patmore, who argued that metre was determined not by accent, but by so-called '"isochronous intervals"' – the time taken to speak the line.[502] But if the textual marks of voice inherent in prosody were not to determine tempo, which framework could the poet-speaker employ to protect the integrity of the poem's temporal line? Unsurprisingly we might look to Pound and his early experiments in France in Rousselot's Laboratoire de Phonétique Experimentale for an answer. Exactly twenty years before Eliot would embark on his own phonetics project at Columbia, Pound, as the scholarship of both Richard Sieburth and Michael Golston has illuminated, was engaged in exhuming the inaudible somatic rhythms embedded within his own verse. With a "quill or tube held in the nostril, a less shaved quill or other tube in the mouth, [and] your consonants signed as you spoke them."[503]

Pound's invective against what he saw to be the "cast-iron" and "machine-like" regularity of the metrics of nineteenth-century verse nevertheless drew on the machinery and science employed towards the end of that century, as Jason Hall has identified, to "articulat[e] an objective, fact-based metrics". Indeed, the empirical methods and technologies adopted by experimental psychologists such as Edward Wheeler Scripture and Thaddeus Bolton and practiced by Rousselot would be used by Pound, not to establish a rigid system of metre, but, as Michael Golston puts it, but to trace the "organic" rhythms of speech:

> What one hears are the rhythms of language as they are generated by human physiognomies deeply marked by the two poles of Rousselot's study: genealogy and geography, or, to put it into a more highly charged parlance, blood and soil.[504]

---

[502] See Jason David Hall, "Mechanized Metrics: From Verse Science to Laboratory Prosody, 1880-1918." *Configurations* 17 (Fall, 2009): 289.
[503] Pound quoted in Richard Sieburth, "The Sound of Pound: A Listener's Guide," *Penn Sound*, 2007, accessed August 12, 2013, http://writing.upenn.edu/pennsound/x/text/Sieburth-Richard_Pound.html#_ednref4.
[504] Golston, 95.

Whilst Eliot's own recordings were not directly concerned with prosodic measurements, Eliot was, however, following in the tradition of survey and curatorship. Indeed, the empirical devices of measurement and recursivity epitomised by Rousselot's phonoscope operated, one could argue, on the boundaries of anthropology and ethnography. For the phonoscope, as Golston explains, "a machine designed to monitor linguistic decay - to at once *hear* and *see* (hence "*phono-scope*") the jeopardized rhythms of languages on the wane", a task similarly undertaken by anthropologists using the phonograph.

It is no coincidence that, towards the end of the nineteenth century, both anthropologists and prosodic scientists were freeing themselves from the limitations imposed by pure textual inscription. For Fewkes, the phonetic system of inscription necessarily excluded the "inflections, gutturals, accents, and sounds in aboriginal dialects" of Indian languages, an omission that the timely arrival of the phonograph could correct.[505] Similarly, the seismographic renderings of the phonoscope used by Rousselot "could actually *hear* (and analytically transcribe) the complexities of each individual poetic voice (down to its regional accents)".[506] Indeed, for my purposes in this chapter, it is the capacity of both of these machines to not only revive and reinvigorate dialect, but to record and permanently archive the regional voice that sets the trajectory of Eliot's own phonetics recording. It is, moreover, out of this fusion of disciplines – anthropology, linguistics, and phonetics – that Eliot established a system of recitation for the radio based not on metrical notation, but on the Poundian notion of melopoeia. Indeed, as the remainder of this chapter will demonstrate, Eliot's phonographic recordings were conducted using the same anthropological methodologies adopted by the linguist William Cabell Greet to archive and collate the voices of Modern American poets, using the phonograph, so that they may be "preserved as they should through the medium of their native speech."[507] The unintended conflation here between the voice of the poet and the phonograph as the chosen "medium of their native speech" fortuitously highlights how the phonograph itself became bound up in scientific and cultural discourses of nativeness. It stood to

---

[505] Jesse Walter Fewkes, "On the Use of the Phonograph in the Study of the Language of American Indians," *Science* 15, no. 378 (May 2, 1890): 267.
[506] Sieburth, "The Sound of Pound: A Listener's Guide".
[507] George W. Hibbitt, "Phonograph Recordings of Poets' Readings." *The English Journal* 25 (June, 1936): 479.

define and preserve the American voice, uniquely transforming America's narrative, in the 1930s, into a "mediated history".[508]

3.4 Anthropology, Culture and the Phonograph

The potential of the phonograph to curate and "perpetuate" the human voice was recognised by Edison himself in 1888:

> It is curious to reflect that the Assyrians and Babylonians, 2,500 years ago, chose baked clay cylinders inscribed with cuneiform characters, as their medium for perpetuating records; while this recent result of modern science, the phonograph, uses cylinders of wax for a similar purpose, but with the great and progressive difference that our wax cylinders speak for themselves, and will not have to wait dumbly for centuries to be deciphered, like the famous Kileh-Shergat cylinder, by a Rawlinson or a Layard.[509]

Drawing on ancient or "primitive" traditions of curatorship, Edison takes pride in the phonograph's ability to make concomitant the voices of the dead and the immediacy of the technology itself. Indeed, the conceivable benefits of the phonograph as put forward by Edison included "phonographic books" for the blind, "the teaching of elocution", the recording of the "last words of dying persons", and, importantly, "[t]he preservation of languages, by exact reproduction of the manner of pronouncing."[510]

Unsurprisingly, early anthropologists and ethnographers were keen to exploit the potential for perpetuation indigenous to the phonograph. What Jason Camlot has identified as the synecdochal potential of the phonograph to contain in the voice the entire person of the speaker as "an alternative to bodily presence" (154) lent itself readily to a science concerned with archiving multiple *specimen* voices and that required a technology that could spatially accommodate such evidence.[511] Furthermore, in what is the first account of the use of the phonograph in the anthropological "field," in 1890, J. Walter Fewkes celebrates the "valuable auxiliary" to experimental research, the phonograph, as a tool that "should be used in the study

---

[508] Mark Goble *Beautiful Circuits: Modernism and Mediated Life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010: 230.
[509] Edison, 645.
[510] Edison, 645-6.
[511] Jason Camlot, "Early Talking Books: Spoken Recordings and Recitation Anthologies, 1880-1920." *Book History* 6 (2003): 154.

of the fast disappearing *languages of races*, and in making records of those which are rapidly becoming extinct".[512] For Fewkes, it was the permanent preservation of the "*characteristics* of their [Passamaquoddie Indian] language" that was the priority of the anthropologist, and not the narrative or the voice of the speaking subject.

Edison's invention chimed with both the imperialist leisure activities of the amateur collector and the newly institutionalized disciplines of ethnography and anthropology. Although Edison could envision the phonograph's vocation as a cultural instrument for the amateur collector, as a scientist, he also saw its place as an empirical instrument adept for work in the anthropological field. It was a dichotomy, however, that was inevitably played out in commercial terms. Jonathan Sterne has noted that the utility of sound recording technology as a means of preservation was touted early on in the phonograph's history, but that this was offset by commercial parties, who frequently considered early recording discs to be mere "ephemera." Jonathan Sterne, for example, has shown there to be a division between those concerned with the cultural legacy potential of sound technology as an artefact, and those for whom the '"the wonder of this new technology lay not in historic preservation but in mass production."'[513]

The mechanical mediation of the voice is generally, though perhaps not intentionally, presented by "sound" and poetry scholars as a malignant counterfeit or deception, a wrenching of the voice from the physical body. Yopie Prins, for example, points to Robert Browning's 1889 recording of his poem "How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix," whose stuttering and uncertain voice "is not his own but a mechanical (re)production detached from himself. The disembodied 'speaker' is the phonograph, which takes the place of both mouth and ear, as it is used first to record and then to play back the recitation of the poem".[514] Moreover, Mark Goble has pointed to the Modernist fascination with the potential to archive that frequently collapsed into a fascination with the instrument of curatorship. Using the archive vault as an example, Goble argues that what makes an image of the archive vault

---

[512] Fewkes, 267.
[513] Jonathan Sterne, "Preserving Sound in Modern America," in *Hearing History: A Reader*, ed. Mark Michael Smith (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 295-296.
[514] Prins, 48-49.

"modernist" is that it "renders the materiality of the vault itself as compelling as all the documents it has been built to save".[515]

Modernism's fascination with the phonograph and the gramophone have been well narrated, particularly with regards the frequently invoked section from Eliot's "The Fire Sermon" in *The Waste Land*:

> When lovely woman stoops to folly and
> Paces about her room again, alone,
> She smoothes her hair with automatic hand,
> And puts a record on the gramophone.

Yet, as suggested above, interpretations of these mechanically voiced interjections are frequently shot through with the unquestioned technological pessimism that pervades the work of the Benjamin and Adorno. For Adorno, the "phonograph record is an object of that 'daily need' which is the very antithesis of the humane and the artistic, since the latter can not be repeated and turned on at will but remain tied to their place and time." It is, he concludes, "not good for much more than reproducing and storing".[516] Meanwhile, for the cultural critic Friedrich Kittler, the phonograph is "incapable of reproducing the human voice in all its strength and warmth. The voice of the apparatus will remain shrill and cold; it has something imperfect and abstract about it that sets it apart".[517] And for literary critics such as Suarez, commenting on the section from "The Fire Sermon" above, the gramophone colludes in producing an environment that makes the apathetic typist "prey to automatism and machine condition". The final indictment against the phonograph is that it "clinches the mechanical squalor of the entire scene, and *comes to stand for the vulgarity and disenchantment of contemporary existence*" (emphasis added).[518]

---

[515] Goble, 230.
[516] Theodor W. Adorno, "The Form of the Phonograph Record", trans. Thomas Y. Levin, *October* 55 (Winter, 1990): 58, 57
[517] Friedrich A. Kittler, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter,* trans. and intro. Geoffrey Winthrop-Young and Michael Wutz (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999), 31-32.
[518] Juan A. Suárez, "'The Waste Land', the Gramophone, and the Modernist Discourse Network." *New Literary History* 32 (Summer, 2001): 749. Suárez is not alone in his condemnation of the gramophone. Tim Armstrong remarks that technologies such as the phonograph and the typewriter "disconnected the production of language from time, distance, and the individual body", had "fragmented the human subject" (*Modernism, Technology, and the Body: A Cultural Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998): 193; 222); Adam Trexler notes that

Such readings are underpinned by a determined agenda that sets out Modernism's supposed hostility to the technological determinism of machines of reproduction, heavily inflected, of course, by the cautionary pronouncements of Benjamin and Adorno. I want to suggest, however, that such an understanding of how Modernist authors and poets such as Joyce, Pound, Stein, and Eliot were suspicious of voice technology profoundly belies and misconstrues the degree to which they willingly embraced and engaged with these technologies as important transmitters of culture, as important artillery in fact, *against* vulgarity. Such indictments as Gregory S. Jay's that the "'automatic hand' that 'puts a record on the gramophone' enforce[s] a feeling of remorseless repetition" not only underestimates the agency Eliot finally relinquishes to the "human engine" at the end of this scene, but participates in a common misreading of these final two lines.[519] We might acquit Eliot's desultory gramophone of charges of cultural degradation, for following the departure of her "lover," Eliot's typist, in choosing to switch on the gramophone within the privacy and comfort of her own space now reclaimed, exercises the only agency in what has otherwise been an "automated" or mechanised day. For from an extension of the mechanical "primal" sexual encounter and labour of the day, the turning on of the gramophone and the selection of a record is a profoundly more intimate act. Moreover, the simplicity of the action is reflected in the employment of the most simple of clause structures – subject, predicate, and object – the gramophone left unmolested by a modifier such as the adjective "automatic", applied not to the machinery but to the repetitive action of the body. In Eliot's narrative, repetitive and automatic behaviour pre-exists in our bodily behaviour – it is innate in a way that technological automatism is not. Rather, the gramophone, here, is used to empower the typist, whose decision to use the gramophone not to augment but to extinguish a series of daily "automated" actions, demonstrates the potential of the phonograph/gramophone to revive humanity. The assumption that the record itself

---

"[m]any contemporaries" of Eliot's *Waste Land* "viewed the rise in industrial production, mechanised labour and the preoccupation with the profit motive as undermining traditional economic and cultural values." ("Economics" in *T. S. Eliot in Context*, ed Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011): 278); and for Lois A. Cuddy, the gramophone is a symbol of the "lack of human improvement" (*T. S. Eliot and the Poetics of Evolution: Sub/versions of Classicism, Culture, and Progress* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2000): 19).

[519] Gregory S. Jay, "Discovering the Corpus" in *T. S. Eliot's* The Waste Land, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House, 2007), 88.

must in some way be "popular culture" is just that: the fact that a routine sexual encounter might be concluded by Stravinsky is somehow never considered.

That is not to say, however, that Eliot was immune to the technology's potential to corrode culture, and, in what was effectively an act of metadiscursive negation, Eliot used a radio broadcast to warn not only the *potential* of technology to contribute to a system of culture predicated on entitlement, but, importantly, to clearly argue against the inevitability of such a system. Indeed, although that "[t[here is the danger of mechanised pleasure – pleasure which gives the enjoyer less and less trouble to procure, and which requires less and less co-operation on his part, pleasure which can be enjoyed passively and stupidly", it is by no means a foregone conclusion. The mistake we are to make is to assume that such technology should actually have any impact on our behaviour at all:

> It is generally assumed that any scientific discovery *must* have some important bearing upon our conception of the universe – not merely the physical universe but the spiritual universe as well – and ultimately upon our conduct and our emotional life. It very often does, but chiefly because we take it for granted that it will. The assumption is very rarely challenged; nevertheless, I see no reason for accepting it.[520]

For the phonograph to be institutionalised, to be seen as an important empirical tool that could salvage culture instead of corrode it, this technology, which "teetered between science and sensation," according to Eric Ames, had to be "refunctionalized for enthnography, [and] the phonograph, like the ethnographic exhibition, would have to be stripped of its sensational qualities".[521] Adorno's rebuke that the phonograph's potential is limited to merely "storing" music misconstrues the degree to which it was being used in scientific and, importantly, at the interface of science and literature, to protect culture from corrosion by commercial and linguistic expansionism, as well as from discourses of cultural hegemony.

Certainly Eliot's early recordings were underpinned by the desire to establish a didactic framework of critical listening, which in turn was predicated on an assumption that students of poetry could be trained in close listening. Eliot's essay on

---

[520] Eliot, "Religion and Science: a Phantom Dilemma." *The Listener* 7 (March 23, 1932): 429.
[521] Eric Ames, "The Sound of Evolution." *Modernism/modernity* 10 (April, 2003): 311.

Ezra Pound: His Metric and Poetry, written in 1917, may not have immediately anticipated the phonograph's role in establishing this framework in (principally) American schools and universities, but, like Packard, he had determined that an understanding of Pound's prosodic programme does "require…a trained ear, or at least the willingness to be trained".[522] Responding to criticism of Pound's verse, which, according to one critic, '"baffles us by archaic words and unfamiliar metres; he often seems to be scorning the limitations of form and metre,"' Eliot rejects the verdict that Pound's poetry is esoteric, for "[h]e [Pound] has always been ready to battle against pedantry." Rather, Pound's metre required an understanding of its culturally immersive origins: having been "supersaturated in Provençe; he had tramped over most of the country; and the life of the courts where the Troubadours thronged was part of his own life to him." Pound's metre doesn't "require a knowledge of Provençal or of Spanish or Italian", but rather a trained ear to the ideophonic and melopoeic properties of rhythm: both Pound and Eliot perceived the power of rhythm to extend the phenomenological and affective potential of a word beyond its base meaning. To become completely fluent in Modernist metrics, therefore, required an ear that had unburdened itself of a learnt (archaic) system of rhythm that could no longer bear the load of the Modern experience.

However, recent scholarship, particularly that of Meredith Martin, has argued convincingly that Pound's "mechanistic" conception of rhythm was constructed to efface the multiple narratives and histories of prosody and to allow him to position himself as the "arbiter and authority" on metrical discourse.[523] Yet the debt that both Pound and Eliot owed to early anthropological thinking on the field praxis of cultural immersion in providing a foundation for how Modernist poets could develop a multilingual system of prosody, as well as a method of training their readers, has not been tapped. Having, by his own admission, "floundered somewhat ineffectually through the slough of philology", Pound, according to his own legend, was eager to divest himself of the "rags of morphology, epigraphy, *privatleben* and the kindred delights of the archaeological or 'scholarly' mind".[524]

---

[522] Eliot, *Ezra Pound: His Metric and Poetry*, (Project Gutenberg 2003), pt2, accessed August 9, 2013, http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7275/7275-h/7275-h.htm.
[523] Martin, 186.
[524] Ezra Pound, *The Spirit of Romance* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1910): v; 5.

Nevertheless, as Eliot's account of Pound's metrical apparatus clearly demonstrates, Pound derived his prosodic innovations by immersion – "supersaturation" – in non-Anglophone cultures, a practice advocated by the Columbia anthropologist Franz Boas in the collection of so-called "American languages." In a 1906 *New York Times* article entitled "Scientists are on the Track of the First American," Boas outlines the aims and methodologies of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, which was designed to establish the ethnographic and "prehistoric" origins of the American Indian. Although the expedition itself was of nationalistic interest, Boas's expeditionary team was an international one, comprised of three Russians, a German and eight Americans. The methodologies employed by this expeditionary force, however, were by no means those of objective bystanders: "To each of these men a certain territory was allotted, *which they explored, living with the native tribes, studying their languages and their general culture.* In some of the more remote regions the visiting specialist was *compelled to live for two or three years*" (emphasis added).[525] Like Pound, Boas was profoundly skeptical of the limitations of the philological practice employed by American scientists in accurately reproducing sounds and rhythms of non-Indo-European languages, particularly scientists whose native tongue originated from a Germanic subset. In an 1888 article "On Alternating Sounds", composed in the same year as Edison's second article on the phonograph, Boas dismisses a phenomenon known at the time as sound-blindness, whereby individuals were supposedly unable to distinguish between certain key sounds and their "peculiarities."[526] The difficulty, argues Boas, is of neither a physiological nor psychological origin, but rather a result of a linguistic and cultural isolationism compounded by a systems of phonetics that cannot accurately represent the sounds of languages outside of one's native subset.

Moreover, the philological errors made by what Boas calls the "collectors" of languages provide evidence enough of how the phonetics system contributes to a linguistic imperialism even in the quest for empiricism: "It is found that the vocabularies of collectors, although they may apply diacritical marks or special alphabets, bear evidence of the phonetics of their own languages. This can be

---

[525] "Scientists are on the Track of the First American." *New York Times* (22 April, 1906): 5.
[526] Boas, "On Alternating Sounds" *American Anthropologist* Vol. 2 (January, 1889): 47.

explained only by the fact that each apperceives the unknown sounds by the means of the sounds of his own language".[527] Boas, at this point, proffers no tangible solution as to how the problem of apperception in the curatorial practice of chronicling American languages might be overcome, but the phonograph, as Fewkes testified, was already proving to be an invaluable tool for faithfully reproducing the sounds of these languages without the fallible mediation of textual inscription. As Erika Brady suggests, the phonograph represented "the human attempt to override the ephemeral nature of the sensory impression, to capture impressions of the moment in a form that would not merely evoke impressionistically but replicate accurately that moment at will" without, we might add, a reliance on the cultural and linguistic predispositions or biases of the collector himself.[528]

Eliot, in turn, was by no means removed from early twentieth-century anthropological discourses on Native Indian languages and cultures, and, in 1904, was in fact in direct contact with the curatorial specimens of both the discipline and the culture. Caroline Patey has pointed to the possibility that the exhibition itself provided the basis for an early short story, published in the school newspaper, entitled "The Man who was King".[529] Ronald Bush, however, has attended more intensively to this formative episode in Eliot's intellectual life, noting that not only did Eliot witness the spectacle of the "native villages", replete with real live exotic "colonial peoples", but that he was, in a sense, attending anthropology's debutante ball, the "Congress of Races" proving itself to be the biggest Anthropological exhibition ever arranged at a world's fair.[530] It was, moreover, the first time that Eliot would encounter the

---

[527] Boas, "On Alternating Sounds", 51.

[528] Speaking, of course, in terms of the act of recording itself: linguistic and cultural hegemony was still very much in play in the selection of the subject him/herself, and, as Brady contends, the spectacle and fascination of the phonograph could be counterproductive: "the introduction of a 'mechanical presence"' embodied in the recording both determined the form in which information was preserved and significantly altered the balance of the entire fieldwork interaction. Its use affected both fieldworker and performer, sometimes supporting and sometime subverting the collaborative aspect of their efforts." Erika Brady, *A Spiral Way: How the Phonograph Changed Ethnography* (Jackson, Miss.: University Press of Mississippi, 1999), 11, 7.

[529] Caroline Patey, "T. S. Eliot and the text of anthropology," in Cianci and Harding, 162-3.

[530] Ronald Bush, "The Presence of the Past: Ethnographic Thinking/Literary Politics," in *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, ed. Elazar Barkin and Ronald Bush (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 25. It

scientific laboratory, for "[m]anning the St. Louis physical anthropology laboratories were colleagues and students of Franz Boas," who was one of the principle advisors to the exhibition.[531] In 1904, Eliot was just a couple of months shy of his sixteenth birthday, and it is possible to overstate how integral this moment might have been in his intellectual development, at least in those early years of his education. This event does demonstrate, however, that Eliot was immersed in a formative episode of anthropology's own history as a discipline, the practices, whilst perhaps spectacles in their embryonic form, nevertheless developing credence as an exciting new branch of science that was establishing itself institutionally.

The 1904 World Fair, however, may very well not have been the only instance during this year where Eliot encountered anthropological discourses, for in September of 1904 the "father of anthropology" Franz Boas spoke at the International Congress of Arts and Science at Washington University in St. Louis. It was in this lecture that Boas, for the first time, set forth a concrete framework for the discipline of anthropology and its social and cultural import:

> Of greater educational importance is its power to make us understand the roots from which our civilization has sprung, that it impresses us with the relative value of all forms of culture, and thus serves as a check to an exaggerated valuation of the standpoint of our own period, which we are only too liable to consider the ultimate goal of human evolution, thus depriving ourselves of the benefits to be gained from the teachings of other cultures and hindering objective criticism of our own work.[532]

---

should be noted, however, that whilst anthropology was beginning to establish itself as a discipline in its own right, progress in the way of funding and publishing was rather slow. Boas, for example, notes how the write-up of the Jesup Expedition had to be published in Holland "Simply because there is a fixed, assured sale for scientific works of this special character abroad, while in this country there is not." It is no coincidence, therefore, that research conducted on Eliot's interest in anthropology, has, with the exception of Manganaro, been largely contained to British anthropologists such as Frazer.

[531] Bush, 32.

[532] Franz Boas "The History of Anthropology" *Science* Vol. 20 (21 October, 1904): 524. Also in attendance at this conference was Otto Jespersen presenting on the "History of the English Language", Pierre Janet on "The Relations of Abnormal Psychology", Frederick Jackson Turner "Problems in American History", and such ethnographical talks as "Extinct Civilizations – Babylon, Assyria, Carthage and Persia"", "The Hoary Orient – India Land of Age and Mysticism", and "Bits of Uncertain History – Origin and Characteristics of Filipino Tribes".

Forty-two years later, broadcasting on the BBC radio for the German programme "Famous Contemporaries" in 1946 (published in *Notes Toward the Definition of Culture* as "The Unity of European Culture"), here is Eliot:

> no one nation, no one language, would have achieved what it has, if the same art had not been cultivated in neighbouring countries and in different languages. We cannot understand any one European literature without knowing a good deal about the others. When we examine the history of poetry in Europe, we find a tissue of influences woven to and fro. There have been good poets who knew no language but their own, but even they have been subject to influences taken in and disseminated by other writers among their people. Now, the possibility of each literature renewing itself, proceeding to new creative activity, making new discoveries in the use of words, depends on two things. First, its ability to receive and assimilate influences from abroad. Second, its ability to go back and learn from its sources.[533]

Indeed, for Boas and Eliot, the social scientist and the poet must be capable of dispensing with the "Culturbrille" [sic], abandoning the systemic tendency to measure the developments of other races against the yardstick of one's own civilization.[534] Moreover, to understand the development of one's own civilization and its attendant culture required a thorough understanding of the cultural contiguity of other nations, tribes, and races, and an appreciation, according to Susan Hegeman, that intersections between proximate groups were "matters of historical contingency".[535]

The new discipline of anthropology, for Boas, demanded a methodology and praxis that could firmly resist an evolutionary theory of culture. Indeed, the idea that there was, in a sense, a prototype schema of cultural evolution from the primitive to the "highest civilization which is applicable to the whole of mankind, that notwithstanding *many variations caused by local and historical conditions*" was completely anathema to Boas. At the newly established Faculty of Anthropology at Columbia (1899), Boas set about erecting and transmitting a methodology that emulated in practice this anti-evolutionist perspective. What the student of anthropology must militate against in in their methodologies was to make a spectacle

---

[533] Eliot, *Notes*, 112-113

[534] Franz Boas, "The History of Anthropology." *Science* 20, no. 512 (October 21, 1904): 517.

[535] Susan Hegeman, *Patterns for American: Modernism and the Concept of Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 35.

out of the cultural practices of Native Indian or indigenous populations. Speaking in 1904, Boas points to the practice of anthropology as having a history long before the discipline was recognized as such, beginning, most famously, with Herodotus, and the Medieval travellers who frequently made their livings out of their reports of alien cultures:

> The literature of the Spanish conquest of America is replete with remarks on the customs of the natives of the New World. But there is hardly any indication of the thought that these observations might be made the subject of scientific treatment. They were and remained curiosities. It was only when their relation to our own civilization became the subject of inquiry that the foundations of anthropology were laid.[536]

Yet Eliot, like Boas, saw that only by curtailing the fetishization and objectification of indigenous cultures could social scientists, historians, artists, to quote his praise for the historical and ethnographic work of Walter Raleigh, recognize "the unit of history, of the relation of the history of one race and nation to that of another".[537] Indeed, in a review of George W. Cronyn's *Anthology of Songs and Chants from the Indians of North America*, Eliot attacks the artistic and translation license of the editor who, he believes, has not applied sufficient linguistic rigour to the translations: "The poet and the anthropologist," he argues, "both want to be provided with these data, and they are the only persons whose desires should be consulted. The poet and the artist and the anthropologist will be the last people to tolerate the whooping brave, with his tale of maple sugar, as a drawing-room phenomenon".[538] This is scathing a rejection of the popularized perception of Native Indian cultures, which, in creeping dangerously close to the walls of academic, high-brow integrity by being printed by Boni and Liveright, threatens to undermine Boas's determination to authenticate the skills of the anthropologist. Eliot's reference to the drawing-room phenomenon, whereby these "translations" could be dramatized and exhibited suggests an antipathy towards the so-called "Indian Craze" that infiltrated wealthy American houses in the early part of the century. According to Elizabeth Hutchinson, collectors would acquire Native American art "often in dense, dazzling

---

[536] Boas, "The History of Anthropology", 514.
[537] Eliot, "Elizabethan Travellers' Tales." *The Listener* 2, no. 36 (July 10, 1929): 60.
[538] Eliot, "War-Paint and Feathers." *The Athenaeum* (October 17, 1919): 1036.

displays called 'Indian corners'".[539] Anthropology as a practice was becoming cultish in the public imagination, compounded, ironically, by its success in amplifying Native Indian narratives. The contact established between the anthropologist and the subject, moreover, brought both cultures into closer contact with each other than ever before. The thorough field excavation work led, according to Hutchinson, to an increased availability of Native American art, some of which actually ended up being commissioned. Still objectified and fetishized, this was not the communal or reciprocal exchange that optimally occurs between cultures as posited later in 1946 by Eliot. Little effort was being made, Eliot observed, to use this contact with "primitive man" to "furthe[r] our understanding of civilized man" and his art and poetry, thereby compromising the potential of this convergence to "revivify contemporary activities."[540] The tendency to treat Native Indian cultural artifacts as products, in fact, could prove pernicious to American culture, suppressing the possibility for reciprocal exchange between cultures: "the country which receives culture from abroad," Eliot wrote in "The Unity of Culture" in 1946, "without having anything to give in return, and the country which aims to impose its culture on another, without accepting anything in return, will both suffer from this lack of reciprocity".[541]

Meanwhile, Eliot's invoking of Raleigh as an early ethnographer is significant in that it forecasts his later assertion in "The Unity of Culture" that it is religion that constitutes the "dominant force in creating a common culture between peoples each of which has its distinct culture".[542] In his broadcast, Eliot foregrounds the collusion between the English and the Inca tribe against the Spanish: with no common language between them, and with only native interpreters to convey a pictorial representation of the "cruelties" of Spanish Catholicism, Raleigh architected an opportunity to destabilize his rival Spanish colonialists by forming an alliance with whose tribes "exasperated by the Spanish".[543] Seventeen years later, this blatantly opportunistic community between cultures is quite possibly not what Eliot had in mind when he points to the development of a common artistic culture born out of religion. Nor does

---

[539] Elizabeth Hutchinson, *The Indian Craze: Primitivism, Modernism, and Transculturism in American Art, 1890-1915* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2009), 3.
[540] War-Paint and Feathers", 1036.
[541] *Notes,* 121.
[542] *Notes*, 122.
[543] Eliot, "Elizabethan Travellers' Tales", 60

it acknowledge outright how Raleigh had been responsible for not only transporting Native Indians back to England where they were taught English by Thomas Hariot, but were inculcated with "customs gentle enough for most of his interpreter-guides to develop lasting loyalty to Sir Walter and his nation."[544]

As suggested above, Eliot's admiration for Raleigh was based on the contribution he made to English literature through the language of felt experience: but Raleigh's expedition also set a precedent unheard of for cultural immersion. Raleigh, according to Alden T. Vaughan, was keenly attuned to the notion that "Language…was an essential instrument of the empire", instructing Hariot not only to teach the would-be interpreters English, but to learn "their Algonkian dialect, dubbed by Harriot 'the *Virginian* language'". This resulted in one of the first phonetics systems of its kind with the development of "An universall Alphabet" consisting of thirty-six syllables that could accommodate the new Virginian language and "any other spoken language from the New World or the Old".[545] This broadcast is further intriguing in that it demonstrates a persistent engagement with anthropological discourses, reflecting directly Boasian concerns with the contingent developments in culture of proximate nations and tribes long before Eliot engaged in a recording project that was born out that very way of thinking. In the broadcast, the printed version of which includes a plate entitled "Raleigh being entertained by the Red Indian", Eliot lauds the efforts of the courtier/poet/traveller/explorer/orator for his ability to shift between formal prose styles, from a "dithyrambic address to Death", to the linguistic peculiarities of the seaman's logbook, to an ethnographic account of his encounters with tribes in South America. Bound together in the intellectual and linguistic development of English culture is Raleigh's capacity to "give a fair plain narrative, with observations on the geography, flora and fauna, and the customs of the inhabitants" with the establishment of the art of "scholarly and reflective history".[546]

Raleigh not only set a precedent for scientific endeavours by troubling historical accounts comprised of "hearsay and old myths and records", but set the foundations for a "concept of civilisation in general, of a process and development in

---

[544] Alden T. Vaughan, "Sir Walter Ralegh's Indian Interpreters, 1584-1618." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 59 (April 2002): 342.
[545] Vaughan, 347.
[546] Eliot, "Elizabethan Travellers' Tales", 60.

the history of people after people".[547] It is curious, however, that Raleigh's ethnographic legacy involved an almost direct inversion of Boas's methodological practice of immersion of the anthropologist in native cultures. The process of linguistic indoctrination that Raleigh imposed on Native Indian interpreters involved their being taken out of their own cultural environment and transplanted in England for several years. Having attained fluency in English, and, presumably, having been exposed to, and fully immersed in, the alien cultural practices of Raleigh's England, they were returned to their own communities accompanied by colonialists. These interpreters, to quote Vaughan, were "culture brokers", whose cultural bilingualism was a central component of England's colonial power.[548] Eliot's own journey from the States to Britain and back again bears a tempting comparison. The collation of the native voices of Modern poets to which Eliot would lend his voice, suggests that Eliot's own role as a culture-broker is perhaps best understood as facilitating, rather than undertaking, cultural interpretation, where "trained" listeners could shift between the poetic idiolects and dialects, tracing the oral genetics that bound these voices together in a specific linguistic family that we call Modernism.

This broadcast, more than any other critical account of Eliot's at this time, illuminates most clearly his path towards Greet, Boas and the Columbia recording studio. In "Tradition and the Individual Talent", he stresses that the poet needed to cultivate a "perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence". This needed to be augmented, moreover, by an understanding of the capacity for distinct historical periods to endure in the cultural memory, the temporal tempered by timelessness. The Modern writer was a composite of tradition and an awareness of his own historical contingency, his own place in cultural memory.[549] However, this was not an accomplishment that was peculiarly Modern, but a skill that had been cultivated by those writers who had managed to develop and expand the English language, who, like Raleigh, had "written about their own experiences with a feeling that they were a part of history".[550]

It is no coincidence, therefore, that Eliot was drawn to an oral project designed to archive and expand the English language through poetry, a medium which, by

---

[547] Eliot, "Elizabethan Travellers' Tales", 60.
[548] See Vaughan, 343.
[549] *The Sacred Wood*, 40.
[550] Eliot, "Elizabethan Travellers' Tales", 60

Eliot's own account, was the best vehicle for transmitting "common speech." The phonograph, as a scientific instrument, was an ideal medium by which to curate both the voices and the historical moment. Each recording was subject to the temporal limitations of the phonograph itself, and to the temporal nature of methodology, which prioritises the date of the recording. The phonograph's potential to endlessly reproduce this temporal moment in the American voice's history, allowed not only the narrative to migrate from the text/eye to the record/ear, but also to foreground the acoustical developments in the English language, which, prior to the invention of sound recording technologies, had been left to the arcane, politicized and inadequate systems of prosody.

Greet's project, moreover, sought to disrupt the phonograph's destructive influence on language by the very process of institutionalization. Like Boas, he strove to give scientific credence to a technology that had been largely absorbed into popular culture where, according to many ethnographers, "it accelerated the process of corruption and decay in traditional ways of life".[551] But if the phonograph itself needed reappropriating, so too did educational and pedagogical frameworks on language. Elocution had been a mainstay of educational curricula for over eighty years, whilst, as Boas noted in 1917, educational policies and Anglo-Saxon linguist hegemony meant that "native languages are being modified by the influence of European languages, not only in vocabulary, but also in phonetics".[552] Marginalised indigenous voices, as well as English-language dialects, were being effaced by progressive policies that were, deliberately or not, being transmitted through the phonograph (and radio). If dialects were to survive, the phonographic voice had to be taught the language of cultural preservation rather than corruption.

3.5 Greet, Boas, and the Mapping the Voice

Very little biographical information exists of the linguist who would be responsible for preserving the voices of many of Modernism's major poets. Having received his M.A. in 1924 and his doctorate in 1926, both from Columbia, he was appointed professor of English at Columbia in 1929 at the age of 28. This role, however, misrepresents his interests, which lay, as his early research suggests, in the

[551] Brady, 2.
[552] Boas, "Introductory." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1 no. 1 (July, 1917): 2.

relationship between poetic voice and dialectic speech patterns, the linguistic mapping of dialects, and discourses of standardization. Greet was also a lexicographer, publishing *World Words: Recommended Pronunciations* in 1944 with a dedication to the BBC's pronunciation advisor Arthur Lloyd James. Indeed, Greet was heavily influenced by Lloyd James's own research into standardised, and institutionalised, pronunciation, and *World's Words*, a pronunciation guide for American broadcasters, closely emulates the structure and the rationale behind Lloyd James's *Broadcast Speech*.[553]

The political and social power of the radio was a concept that was not lost on Greet: for radio to effectively accommodate and transmit social and cultural agendas, a degree of linguistic and formal hegemony was required that could appeal to "a wide audience in a nation where there are regional types of speech".[554] So acute was his belief that form and pronunciation could potentially alienate an audience, who admit the speaker into [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], that Greet sent copies to a number of senior political figures, including President Roosevelt, the Vice President Henry Wallace, the Chief of Staff George Marshall, and J. Edgar Hoover. From 1934, having tentatively discussed the possibility of a committee "[This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] with his long-time friend H. L. Mencken, Greet took on the role of consultant on pronunciation to the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS).[555] Although he advocated against prescriptivism in favour of what he called "'liberal' standards", Greet was frequently petitioned by individual broadcasters to arbitrate and rectify errors in pronunciation.[556]

However, it was as an "Authority on U.S. Dialects" that he would be remembered by *The New York Times* in 1972. Indeed, Greet's "liberal" approach to

---

[553] According to Greet, CBS Radio used Lloyd James's booklets and guides to pronunciation until the publication of his own primer in 1944. Cabell Greet to Hugh C. Shelley (Manager of Radio KBEE AM and KBEE FM), letter, April 27, 1961, "William Cabell Greet Papers Spec MS Coll. Greet", University of Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.

[554] Cabell Greet, William. *World Words: Recommended Pronunciations.* 2nd and revised edition. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948): xiii.

[555] H. L. Mencken to WCG, letter, October 1929, 1934, "William Cabell Greet Papers. Spec MS Coll. Greet", University of Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.

[556] WCG to Max Eastman, letter, April 28, 1938 "William Cabell Greet Papers. Spec MS Coll. Greet", University of Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.

pronunciation dates back to his first years as a professor at Columbia and his research into American dialects. By the time Eliot had contributed his own phonographic footprint in 1933, Greet had been busy for over five years in not only archiving the voices of his students at Columbia "in the pure dialects of their native localities", but he had also been collating and cataloguing the dialects of numerous communities around America.[557] This peripatetic "phonographic expedition", which involved transporting his recording equipment around in the back of a Ford roadster for road trips from Virginia to Vermont, was part of a larger collaborative project designed to map, contextualise and archive dialects from across the country.

The seeds for this project were planted at the forty-fifth annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in 1928, at which Greet delivered a paper on an experimental series of twenty-four phonograph recordings he had made that year of various American dialects. At the conclusion of the session, a motion was passed that a committee, including Greet "and such other persons as they should select, be appointed to gather information on American dialects and to prepare a speech map of the United States".[558] Yet, fundamental to the practices employed by Greet and other linguists interested in producing an oral topography of America was the availability of both a framework of investigation as well as a theoretical structure from which to understand the coextant relationship between the development of language and culture. Julie Tetel Andresen has argued that the origins of linguistics as a distinct discipline in the early twentieth century owed much to the "progressive dismantling of the political conception of language," which had been integral to the political objective of national unity. The subsequent rise "of the mechanical conception of language" meant that questions of nationhood and nationality shifted territory from linguistics to anthropology. [559] Indeed, Boas, in 1904, affirms the place of philology in anthropological studies, and the origins of language "owing to its relation to the development of culture, …has a direct anthropological bearing."[560] However, as this section will reveal, linguists such as Greet drew heavily both on the practices of

---

[557] "Columbia to Record 26 Dialects Today" *New York Times,* August, 2, 1928.
[558] PMLA."Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America." *PMLA* 43, Supplement. Proceedings and List of Members of the Modern Language Association of American (1928): l.
[559] Julie Tetel Andresen*, Linguistics in America 1769-1924: A Critical History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990): 170-1.
[560] Boas, "The History of Anthropology", 518.

anthropology and the theory that if language was culturally contingent on a national or tribal level, dialect was culturally contingent at the local. The physical proximity of Boas and his department at Columbia, coupled with its infamy, allowed Greet greater access to these practices than would otherwise have been achievable. Indeed, letters between Greet and Boas are in existence and illuminate a professional relationship between the two men.[561]

In 1928, the same year that a laboratory of physical anthropology was installed at the University for Boas and his department, Greet obtained a $500 grant from Columbia to systematically record the dialects from among 14,000 students. Greet's method of collection, however, bears a strong resemblance not only to Boasian practices of language curatorship, but also to Eliot's practice of the extraction and recontextualisation of conversations that *The Waste Land*'s guide, Tiresias, tunes into. As Marc Manganaro has observed,

> If the poem is a literalized Boasian storehouse of a museum crammed with cultural artifacts, then Tiresias functions, as does Boas, both as the ever-recording objective ethnographer-gatherer and as curator; Eliot himself, in his 'Notes' describes him as 'a spectator and not indeed a "character"' but nonetheless 'the most important personage in the poem, uniting all the rest'.[562]

As Tiresias moves through the different bandwidths of conversation, from the ineffable protestations of Philomel to the tawdry but chronologically complex "dialogue" between two Cockney housewives, the effect is not only chaotic and disorientating, but empirically ruthless. The dialogue of the housewives is not only interrupted by the disembodied calls for time of the landlord, but is violently curtailed as the "ethnographer-gather" loses interest and pans out: "And they asked me in to dinner, to get the beauty of it hot –".[563]

Greet's Tiresian persona, by contrast, elicits a rather different response. When playing "200 snatches of conversation recorded on the campus" to over 1200 alumni of the University, instead of disorientation it elicits "laughter".[564] These fragments of

---

[561] See letters from Greet to Boas in the "Franz Boas Papers", American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.
[562] Marc Manganaro, *Culture 192*2: The Emergence of a Concept (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 45.
[563] *CPP,* 66.
[564] "200 American Dialects Recorded at Columbia; Dr. Greet 'Plays' Collection on Phonograph" *New York Times,* October 30, 1929.

dialect, wrenched from their prior origins, are transformed in this moment from scientific specimens to popular spectacle, the curious doubling of their function preparing them for their sequestering "in the university museum." It is the unsettled fate of the museum specimen, however, to be subject to a tripartite existence: according to Boas, a museum may provide "healthy entertainment," it may be an institution "intended for instruction," or it may be "for the promotion of research."[565] This uneasy oscillation between specimen and spectacle made it necessarily difficult for the "dialect hunter" to "secure subjects. People do not like to be specimens," explained Greet.[566] Except, perhaps, for poets.

When Greet wrote to Eliot at Harvard to invite him to record *The Waste Land* in April 1933, Eliot had just returned from giving the Page-Barbour Lectures at the University of Virginia. These lectures would form the basis of *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy* (1934), and were controversial from their publication for the largely prejudicial and anti-Semitic remarks contained within. Scholarship conducted by such researchers as Joshua L. Miller, for example, can help illuminate the context, though not excuse, Eliot's remarks, particularly on immigration. Virginia, he asserts, unlike New York which was subject to an "influx of foreign populations", has "been less industrialised and less invaded by foreigners."[567] Eliot's remarks emerged at a time, however, when discourses on linguistic purity and the threat to a newly-understood *American* cultural hegemony were being stoked by fervent nationalist politicians, some of whom, according to Miller, "[s]ought to declare English as the sole legitimate language of the United States" through legislation.[568] Miller's contends, moreover, that U. S. literary modernism was "charged by turn-of-the-century trends of unparalleled immigration into the national and the imperial expansion projects that pushed national boundaries ever further outward".[569]

---

[565] Franz Boas, "Some Principles of Museum Administration" *Science* 25, no. 650 (June 14, 1907): 921. So important was the institutional notion of preservation for Boas, that he formally introduced a course for advanced students at Columbia on museum administration. See Boas, "Anthropological Instruction in Columbia University" in *A Franz Boas Reader* ed. George W. Stocking (London: University of Chicago Press, 1982): 292.
[566] William Cabell Greet, "A Phonographic Expedition to Williamsburg, Virginia" *American Speech* Vol. 6, No. 3 (February, 1931): 162.
[567] *After Strange Gods*, 15, 16.
[568] Miller, 9.
[569] Miller, 8.

Recorded modernism, too, was engaged in negotiating these trends. The cartographical projects that linguists such as Greet were launching, as well as the poetry recordings designed to capture the native voices of American poets, may well be interpreted as assisting to some degree in those "imperial expansion projects" by insisting on a linguistic and cultural hegemony. But, as Eliot notes in his broadcast "The Unity of European Culture", "We need variety in unity: not the unity of organization, but the unity of nature".[570] Indeed, in his 1946 broadcast, Eliot would emphasise the need for cultural osmosis among different "peoples," where the "The frontiers of culture are not, and should not be, closed".[571] Eliot's understanding of how *literary* culture rarely respects the imagined boundaries between nations clearly evolved from this moment in his professional life. Furthermore, the emphasis placed on "preservation" of linguistic and poetic tradition could be perceived as more suggestive of acceptance of linguistic change. As Eliot articulates in "The Social Function of Poetry", twenty years after the recording:

> We may say that the duty of the poet, as poet, is only indirectly to his people: his direct duty is to his *language*, first to preserve, and second to extend and improve…[The genuine poet] discovers new variations of sensibility which can be appropriated by others. And in expressing them he is developing and enriching the language which he speaks.[572]

Eliot, here, is careful to depoliticise poetry, the mandate to national culture being through the development of language. This sentiment, however, was not new, Eliot, in 1922, arguing that "literature is not primarily a matter of nationality, but of language; the traditions of the language, not the traditions of nation or the race, are what first concern the writer".[573] What the phonograph had the potential to do, was not merely to "preserve" the voices of Modern poets, but provide a back catalogue of voices readily available to emerging poets who could, in Greet's words, approach the recordings as a "living and permanent body of fact," historic artifacts, on which to "extend and improve".[574]

---

[570] *Notes,*120.
[571] *Notes,* 114.
[572] Eliot, "The Social Function of Poetry", 20.
[573] Eliot, "The Three Provincialities" *Tyro* No. 2 (1922): 12.
[574] Harry Morgan Ayres and William Cabell Greet, "American Speech Records at Columbia University." *American Speech* 5, no. 5 (June, 1930): 339.

Eliot's early remarks in *After Strange Gods*, then, engender a specific and unique moment in which Eliot engages with the specific question of the future of *American* culture, thus providing a curious insight into why Eliot agreed to participate in a project designed to counter the fact that, according to Greet, "our poets had not been preserved as they should through the medium of their native speech".[575] Indeed, both Greet and Eliot, it seems, shared mutual concerns over the continuation of regional or local culture. For Eliot,

> the local community must always be the most permanent, and…the concept of the nation is by no means fixed and invariable. […]It is only a law of nature, that local patriotism, when it represents a distinct tradition and culture, takes precedence over a more abstract national patriotism. This remark should carry more weight for being uttered by a Yankee.[576]

Why Eliot would, at this moment, choose to repudiate his St Louis origins has continued to puzzle scholars, and here I too can only offer suppositions. Eliot's assertion only a few sentences before that tradition is "only one fluctuating circle of loyalties between the centre of the family and the local community, and the periphery of humanity entire" references, perhaps, the playing out of the Civil War in St Louis, "the greatest disaster in the whole of American history," which not only shattered "native culture" but divided families along partisan lines. The effect upon Eliot of a Civil War that occurred over twenty years before his birth is perhaps underestimated. Born into a state whose "native culture" had been fractured and fragmented by political division, in 1933 he was still skeptical that the "ill-effects [of the Civil War] are obliterated by time" – "time is no healer" as he reminds us in "The Dry Salvages".[577] Eliot's claim to be a New Englander, however, was not a temporary lapse in the autobiographical narrative that he constructed over many years: indeed, on being awarded the Emerson-Thoreau medal by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1959, he repeated the assertion, suggesting that he was as much a New Englander as Robert Frost, who was born in San Francisco. For Eliot, it is the potential of landscape to be "emotionally charged" for the poet that determines the development of his poetic language. Although Eliot, later on in his life, would stop short of calling himself a New Englander in terms of belonging, reaffirming his St

---

[575] Hibbitt, "Phonograph Recordings of Poets' Readings", 479.
[576] *After Strange Gods*, 20.
[577] *After Strange Gods*, 20, 16.

Louis origins in "American Literature and the American Language," I think it is of linguistic belonging or heritage to which Eliot referred as early as 1933.

Indeed, Eliot may not have allowed for the republication of these lectures following their hostile reception by critics, but twenty-five years later, in *Notes Towards a Definition of Culture*, he would reaffirm the place that local tradition had in providing the physical, emotional and historical proximity required to establish the synapses of cultural transmission: "On the whole," he reminds us, "it would appear to be for the best that the great majority of human beings should go on living in the place in which they were born. Family, class, and local loyalty all support each other; and if one of these decays, the others will suffer also".[578] Coursing through Eliot's theories on culture, however, is a pervasive conflict between stasis and fertilization. This is demonstrated early on in Eliot's poetry, as in "Cousin Nancy," which is included in the 1917 *Prufrock* collection. In this poem, the weight of Miss Nancy Ellicot's modernity, characterized by such behavior as smoking and dancing "modern dances," collapses the "barren New England hills," which have withered from a lack of intercultural stimulus.[579] Indeed, sat permanently on the "glazen shelves" are pictures of "Matthew and Waldo, guardians of the faith, // The army of unalterable law" and the only bulwark between modernity and an erroneous appreciation of tradition: "tradition" according to Eliot in 1934, did not equate to "indulg[ing] a sentimental attitude towards the past" or the "maintenance of certain dogmatic beliefs," but rather it existed to "stimulate" new life.[580]

Yet nowhere in Eliot's critical or poetical canon is this theory of linguistic and cultural cross-fertilization more prominent than in his consistent use of ornithological anecdotes and imagery as a synecdoche for linguistic migration and its capability to effect cultural change and the development of civilization. Eliot's fascination with ornithology was shared by, or perhaps inherited from, his cousin Samuel Atkins Eliot, the son of Charles Eliot Norton (a Harvard President at the time of Eliot's own education there), who would go on to write *Birds of the Connecticut Valley in Massachusetts* in 1937. Eliot returns to New England in his poem "Cape Ann,"

---

[578] *Notes,* 52.
[579] *CPP,* 30.
[580] *After Strange Gods*, 18-19.

composed, according to A. David Moody, in 1933, and which rivals *The Waste Land* in its vociferousness.[581]

The polyphony in this poem, however, is not of human voices, but exclusively of seabird songs unique to birds native of the New England region. From the "song-sparrow" to the "goldfinch", the "quail" to the "purple martin", each has its individual taxonomical attributes and behavior, each a distinctive and inimitable voice that separates it from the other species and allows the ornithologist narrator to map the "dance", the "flight", the "whistle" of each species amidst the "palaver" of languages. As the reader's perspective is rapidly shifted with urgent imperatives to "follow the dance", "Leave to chance", "Hail // With shrill whistle", "Follow the feet", and "Greet // in silence", competition for the observer's attention to record the distinctive, "delectable" dialects and customs of each species is cut short by the narrator's own appeal to the birds themselves:

> Sweet sweet sweet
>
> But resign this land at the end, resign it
>
> To its true owner, the tough one, the sea-gull.[582]

In comparison to the delicate indigenous birds of New England, which require observational skill and dexterity to locate ("O quick quick quick, quick hear the song-sparrow"), the territorial seagull, by its very prevalence and universality – native nowhere and everywhere – reappropriates its land merely by its size, number, and, above all, its resilience to colonization.

Although Moody suggests that Eliot makes few references to "an adult experience of American life and manners," the only exceptions childhood recollections or birds making their way into his poetry, Eliot's ornithology provided a firm metaphorical platform on which to apply the natural migrations and domination patterns of languages and dialects.[583] Moreover, Genevieve Abravanel's assertion that "[f]or Eliot, Americanization is largely the erasure of culture," a threat to the "ordinary things" of English life, is also perhaps too simplistic a position to adopt given Eliot's early investment and consequent research into the linguistic and cultural hegemony *within* American institutions, whilst preserving a distinctly *American*

---

[581] A. David Moody, *T. S. Eliot: Poet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 183.
[582] *CPP*, 142.
[583] A. D Moody, "T. S. Eliot: The American Strain," in *The Placing of T. S. Eliot* ed. Jewel Spears Brooker (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 85.

literary language.[584] Indeed, the longevity of this synecdoche is ensured by the bird's reappearance in "American Literature and The American Language" nearly thirty years later, discussed in Chapter One. Nestled in an attack against Mencken's conflation of language and politics, Eliot concludes that it is the natural pattern of things that English linguistic influences should oscillate between America and Britain, with the prevailing conditions favouring, at that time, West to East migration. Never so strong, however, that a complete effacement of one or the other "language" should take place, "there will always be other influences tending towards fusion."[585]

Thirty years earlier, Eliot had noticed a reversed trend whilst at Harvard, where he observed for the first time the new arrival of the English swallow.[586] Yet whilst linguistic intermarriage is inevitable, Eliot acknowledges the need for a means of archiving the sounds of contemporary literary language. The legacy of one's literary corpus depends upon the linguistic commonality of the idiom that the author adopts: employing the "common language" of the time mitigates against the chances of one's texts being preserved "heavily annotated by learned scholars" who "will be completely in the dark as to how our beautiful lines should be pronounced".[587] Linguistic boundaries, then, needed to be respected only in the archives, whilst allowing for the natural flourishing and cross-fertilization of languages in real time.

Certainly, Eliot was sufficiently alert to the multiplicity of dialects within the New England region to correct an assumption of the BBC's Ian Cox that there was only one definitive accent in circulation. Cox wrote to Eliot in 1938 asking Eliot to participate in a radio adaptation of Melville's *Moby Dick* as the First and Third Nantucket Sailor. Set in Eliot's "country", Cox saw no

> [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[588]

Far from Eliot's usual [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], Cox fuses together the linguistic and the performative in his suggestion that Eliot slip into one of his other "skins". Although calling on Eliot

---

[584] Genevieve Abravanel, *Americanizing Britain: The Rise of Modernism in the Age of the Entertainment Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 133.
[585] Eliot, "American Literature and the American Language", 9.
[586] Eliot, "The Appreciation of Poetry." *The Critic* 18, no. 5 (April-May, 1960): 14
[587] Eliot, Eliot, "American Literature and the American Language", 7.
[588] Ian Cox to TSE, letter, October 14, 1938, "Rcont 1. Eliot, T. S. Talks File 2. 1938-1943", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

precisely because he identifies New England as Eliot's homeland – [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] – there is nevertheless the understanding that Eliot would have to perform the local dialect.

Originating from conversations Cox had overheard between Eliot and Frank Morley, which included an exchange of songs such as "Frankie and Johnnie" and "The Reconstructed Rebel", Cox expresses his desire to see "those sounds" transposed into the "scene." Accent, for Cox, is deeply associated with performativity, but nevertheless a performativity that could rearticulate linguistic authenticity and belonging to such a degree as to mitigate the rejection by Eliot's New England relations. There is a suggestion, moreover, that the ostracism imposed on Eliot's immediate family on the grounds of their St Louis roots extends to the revocation of language itself and the permission to partake in an intimate linguistic network peculiar to the region and to the culture of the people. In his response to Cox, Eliot rejects the association almost outright: *Moby Dick* he finds to be "tumid" in style and quite outside the boundaries of common speech he was promoting at the time. Eliot points, however, to the geographical variations in dialect unacknowledged by Cox:

> [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[589]

Eliot was indeed familiar with matters pertaining to dialect thanks in large part to his proximity to Greet's own cartographical investigations into New England dialects, which formed not only the kernel of the poetry recordings of poets in their native speech, but were concomitant with them. To Cox, however, he readjusts the narrative of his understanding of New England dialect, the crossing out of "acquaintance with" to be replaced by "ability to handle" suggesting not a deficiency in knowledge but in the physical ability to reproduce the sounds of the region. By repudiating his cultural and linguistic association with Nantucket through the dismissal of the rhetorically turgid prose of *Moby Dick* to the extent that he cannot, even through will, invoke the South Shore dialect, he reclaims "my own North Shore speech". This definitively "American" broadcaster who, in a 1943 "Speakers Report", was described by the BBC as being [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright

[589] TSE to Ian Cox, letter, October 14, 1938, "Rcont 1. Eliot, T. S. Talks File 2. 1938-1943", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

reasons], is seen to be fighting against regional homogeneity in culture and language, even as the BBC attempt to define his voice in relation to just that.[590]

Eliot was by no means impervious to the discourses of linguistic homogeneity that had permeated the microphones at the BBC since 1928. Eliot's rallying against standardized English originated from a theory shared by Greet of the triadic relationship between poetic language, place, and dialect. Speaking in a 1942 lecture on "The Music of Poetry", Eliot points to the pernicious consequences of programmes of standardized speech in typical Eliotic style by proclaiming to refuse to discuss the subject at all:

> The music of poetry, then, must be a music latent in the common speech of its time. And that means also that it must be latent in the common speech of the poet's *place*. It would not be to my present purpose to inveigh against the ubiquity of standardized, or 'B.B.C.' English. If we all came to talk alike there would no longer be any point in our not writing alike: but until that time comes – and I hope it may be long postponed – it is the poet's business to use the speech which he finds about him, that with which he is most familiar. I shall always remember the impression of W. B. Yeats reading poetry aloud. To hear him read his own works was to be made to recognize how much the Irish way of speech is needed to bring out the beauties of Irish poetry: to hear Yeats reading William Blake was an experience of a different kind, more astonishing than satisfying. Of course, we do not want the poet merely to reproduce exactly the conversational idiom of himself, his family, his friends and his particular district: but what he finds there is the material out of which he must make his poetry. He must, like a sculptor, be faithful to the material in which he works; it is out of sounds that he has heard that he must make his melody and harmony.[591]

In binding the poet to his respective place, poetry, for Eliot, not only archives the common language of a particular region, but also inevitably binds that poet to a particular culture. For a poet who frequently described himself as a metic, this is an assertion that enacts a degree of regional and perhaps national stability, but it facilitates the poet's ownership of a particular idiom in as much as Eliot wished it to

---

[590] "Producers' comments on Speakers – 1954, EF-EM", March 16, 1943, BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[591] Eliot, "The Music of Poetry", 31-2.

be one that others shared. Yeats's poetry, which demanded the Irish way of speaking to illuminate its beauty, subtly articulates the argument that a poet's rendering of his own prosodic line is rather like a vocal footprint. However, the dangers of such standardizing influences as BBC English was not only that it had the potential to efface regional dialects, but that, in doing so, it could efface the mechanism by which to archive those dialects.

For Greet, standardization was also a pervasive and pernicious impediment to the mapping of dialects. Over the previous hundred years, America's educational system had seen an increasing rise in elocutionary teaching, which was designed to introduce a level of linguistic cohesiveness to a country fractured by both War and national ties. Yet this system was, as Greet recognized, having a devastating effect on the English-language dialects, which had been cultivated in localities from a range of European language families. It was becoming increasingly difficult to obtain "exact" dialects because of institutional and national policy that produced a "standardized language among educated people.[592] Recounting his 1930 "Phonographic Expedition to Williamsburg, Virginia," Greet noticed that the proximity of other European-based dialects were being compounded by the modern phenomena of migration, discovering that the "population of Williamsburg was not so homogenous as we had expected". Finding that only five out thirty-five guests at a dinner at the local Rotary Club had been born locally, Greet recognized the imperative to obtain the "older Williamsburg speech spoken in the better families and *imitated* by their servants. We have records of four generations of one family, the great grandfather being over ninety."[593] The infiltration of different dialects from across the nation (thanks to economical and infrastructural developments), as Eliot himself recounted with his ornithological analogy, meant that "traditional" dialects were dissolving under the pressure of integration.

For Fewkes, the impulse to archive was itself a mark of a developed civilization, a symbol of cultural advancement. With younger generations

---

[592] In 1917, Boas, too, found that "native languages are being modified by the influence of European languages, not only in vocabulary, but also in phonetics and grammar". It was vital, therefore, "to obtain text material also from the older generation, because it is required for the study of recent development of the languages." See Boas, "Introductory", 2.

[593] Greet, "A Phonographic Expedition to Williamsburg, Virginia." *American Speech* 6, no. 3 (February, 1931): 162-3.

disinterested in preserving the native customs of their ancestors, Fewkes advocated instead a process of enforced preservation using the phonograph, which could "indelibly fix their languages".[594] Resistance and hostility to this enforced archiving was also present in Virginia, where, according to Greet, subjects were wary of the intentions of the linguist, though not surprisingly given Mencken's attack on Virginia in *The Sahara of Bozart*. Nevertheless phonograph's capacity to arbitrate between preserving the "recent past" and recording for posterity the "modern", meant that it could not only prevent cultural atrophy – it could, in Eliot's words, "grow a contemporary culture from the old roots" – but endowed agency on the linguist and anthropologist to determine a cultural hierarchy.[595] Like Fewkes, however, Eliot too associated the lack of impetus to preserve a feature of primitive civilization, arguing in the introduction to his 1932-33 lectures *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* that "The people which ceases to care for its literary inheritance becomes barbaric," a proposition repeated nearly twenty years late in *Definition of Culture*:

> a tradition without intelligence is not worth having, to discover what is the best life for us not as a political abstraction, but as a particular people in particular place; what in the past is worth preserving and what should be rejected[.][596]

The dialect recordings, designed to supplement linguistics and phonetics courses in universities throughout America, provided a unique and improved alternative to the traditional system textual preservation: phonetics. Like Fewkes, who expressed concern at the limitations of the phonetics system to accurately represent the sounds of the "aboriginal language," Greet also acknowledged the inadequacy of the traditional system to reproduce the '"nuances of American dialects"'. The phonograph, in contrast, could mimetically capture the wide variety of sounds inherent in a multitude of dialects "'because it will be an exact recreation of the human voice.'"[597] In his experiments with dialect, Greet followed in the footsteps of his Columbia colleague William Morrison Patterson, who had made "sound-photography" recordings of Amy Lowell reading her poetry, in recording "metrical

---

[594] Fewkes, 269.
[595] *Notes*, 53.
[596] Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* 5; *Notes*, 19.
[597] "Dialects on Phonograph to Aid Students; Columbia Plans Disc 'Library' of Our Speech" *New York Times,* July 20, 1928.

patterns," and who had, like Greet, drawn heavily on Franz Boas's work on rhythm.[598] Greet found that the pressure of the microphone could eliminate those affected pronunciations encouraged by standardization, but that this occurred frequently at the cost of natural rhythms of speech. The educated speaker, in contrast, could retain the natural pronunciation and the natural rhythms of the spoken word. For Modernist poets, and particularly for Eliot for whom the common language of the native idiom defined the prosodic line, Greet's phonographic paradigm of preserving the Modern voice and its attendant rhythms were consonant with Eliot's embryonic theories on encapsulating the language of the poet's place.

The origins of Greet's oral poetry collection, however, began not with Eliot, but with Vachel Lindsay. Lindsay, whose infamous recital method of rhythmically chanting his poetry funded both his notoriety and his writing career, approached Greet to make phonograph recordings of his poetry, having been turned away by commerical recording companies. Greet, in turn, was incensed by the recording industry, which profiteered from scientific developments but "who have done nothing to preserve our cultural heritage, insulting one of our significant poets," developing his own recording apparatus for the purpose of "making records of our culture for a university library, in gathering evidence of American dialects, and promoting new methods of teaching speech and foreign languages".[599] Eliot's 1930 proposal to Herbert Gorman to establish a subscription club for phonograph records demonstrates a shared conviction with Greet of the potential for the phonograph to preserve and develop literary culture. But Eliot, too, as David Chinitz has noted, was attentive to the value of dialect to develop, or "fertilize" language: "It was in 1923, just when *Sweeney Agonistes* was brewing in his imagination, that Eliot praised [Marianne] Moore not for eluding the jumble of American dialect but for adhering to it and for contributing to its expressive possibilities".[600] That is not to say, however, that Eliot's engagement with this project was done so without a level of theoretical ambivalence as to the way that language, as opposed to culture, was engaged in a process of osmosis or reciprocal fertilization. Poetry, he argued in "The Social Function of

---

[598] See William Morrison Patterson *The Rhythm of Prose*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916.
[599] "The Lindsay Records" *The Elementary English Review* Vol. 9, No. 5 (May, 1932): 122; 128.
[600] David E Chinitz. *T. S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 118.

Poetry", "makes a difference to the speech, to the sensibility, to the lives of all the members of a society, to all the members of the community, to the whole people, whether they read and enjoy poetry or not: even, in fact, whether they know the names of their greatest poets or not".[601] Whilst the phonograph facilitated a greater level of agency on the part of the consumer, it lacked the democratic level of accessibility that underpinned radio, given that only a certain demographic could invest in a phonograph player and records.

Greet's phonetics project likewise installed educational and social boundaries around his recording laboratory. Writing to John Gould Fletcher in 1934 to invite him to lend his voice to the growing collection, George W. Hibbitt (Greet's assistant) explained that the records were designed to [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[602] Just as the dialect records would be kept in the University's museum, so too would the poetry records be sequestered away – [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], wrote Hibbitt to James Stephens – specimens restricted to those educationally "prepared" to encounter, and choosing to encounter, the recording of the poem, and who are well-versed in the theoretical and critical frameworks that scaffold those texts.[603] Indeed, whilst Eliot was averse to the duplication of his records for commercial purposes, he consented in 1939 to a request by Greet to provide copies of his early recordings to Bryn Mawr.

Lindsay, Eliot, Frost, and the entire community that comprised this recording repository helped to establish a living archive of voices that could both inhabit the present and the past. They could be invoked by the student or poet for whom one objective is "to explore the musical possibilities of an established convention of the relation of the idiom of verse to that of speech," whilst it could allow, at the same time, for the poet "to catch up with the changes in colloquial speech, which are fundamentally changes in thought and sensibility." These two objectives, as outlined in "The Music Of Poetry" in 1942, mark a refinement in Eliot's understanding of the legacy not just of the poet, but of the poet's idiom. The commitment of the poet to the

---

[601] "The Social Function of Poetry", 22.
[602] Hibbitt to John Gould Fletcher, letter, January 9, 1934, "George W. Hibbitt Correspondence", University of Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.
[603] George W. Hibbitt to James Stephens, letter, November 7, 1934, "George W. Hibbitt Correspondence", University of Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.

future of the language, however, required more than innovation in the present: it required a relinquishing of the language of the future. For as he articulates in "Little Gidding", completed and published also in 1942,

> For last year's words belong to last year's language
> And next year's words await another voice.[604]

[604] *CPP*, 194.

Chapter Four: The Master and Warden: T. S. Eliot and the Defence of Copyright

> "It is a common delusion – from which publishers and booksellers are not exempt – that the problems we are called upon to solve and the circumstances in which we are placed are peculiar to our own land and generation."
> Stanley Unwin, "Preface" to Charles Knight's *Shadows of the Old Booksellers* (1927).

In 1919, and not for the first time, *The Little Review* faced suppression by the U.S. Postal Office for its publication of instalments of *Ulysses*. With prosecution looming on the grounds that it violated Section 211 of the U.S. Criminal Code for obscenity, Ezra Pound and the editors of *The Little Review,* Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap, launched an offensive against the Code as "the most outrageous and incredible document I have ever read".[605] Once again patron of the Modern arts and lawyer John Quinn was called upon to defend the *Review* against yet another indictment for contravening the U.S. obscenity laws. Quinn, despite being, as Timothy Materer observes, thoroughly frustrated with Pound and Anderson's quixotic refusal to see what he considered to be a blatant contravention of the law, was nevertheless conscripted into the fight by Pound to write a defence of *Ulysses*.[606] Pound, impressed by Quinn's apologia, was in turn quick to secure trans-Atlantic support by calling upon T. S. Eliot, then editor of *The Egoist*, to reprint the article in the UK. In a letter to Quinn in July of the same year, Eliot reveals his strategic position both in the battle and in the war: "I have just received from Pound in France a copy of your admirable defense of *Ulysses* (May *L. R.*) with the suggestion that it

---

[605] Ezra Pound to Margaret Anderson, January 17, 1918 in *Pound/The Little Review: The Letters of Ezra Pound to Margaret Anderson:* The Little Review *Correspondence*, eds. Thomas L. Scott and Melvin J. Friedman (London: Faber and Faber, 1988), 174.
[606] Timothy Materer, *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn 1915-1924* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1991), 173-5.

should be printed in the *Egoist* when and if I receive permission from you. I hope to get this permission. The affair is only one more episode in a national scandal."[607]

Eliot, like Quinn whose defence was ultimately never published in either *The Little Review* or *The Egoist*, betrays here a certain degree of caution and reticence. Indeed, Eliot is careful to assign sole authorship of the "suggestion" to Pound, whose own war rhetoric calling for collective action against Section 211 – "It is a labour of patriotism wherefrom we must not shrink" – is here subtly reconstituted into collective responsibility. Where Pound's "labour of patriotism" spotlights the individual's role in assaulting legislation "which lumps literature and instruments for abortion into one clause" as an uniquely American obligation ("the idea that one could do something with America dies hard"), the "national scandal" to which Eliot refers implies the collective failings not only of institutions but of individuals, including of authors themselves. More important, however, in this appeal to publish an indictment against the obscenity laws is Eliot's request – uttered twice in close proximity – for "permission", and this careful juxtaposition is, in many ways, central to any understanding of what might be termed Eliot's political position on copyright law. Quinn may well have been preparing to risk professional exposure, but Eliot's emphasis on permission clearly asserts the *responsibility* assumed by authors when their works were published and copyrighted. Acquiring copyright does not merely attribute credit to the author and secure protection against unauthorised reproduction: it also endows the author with responsibility for what he has set down on paper and likewise bestows on him any legal consequences as a result of that inscription. Authorial ownership, then, was to be understood by Eliot as a liability, in both senses of that word.

Scholarship on the history of copyright has, however, contributed to this effacement of the notion of authorial obligation and responsibility, with emphasis instead being placed on the entitlement of the author to legal protection and remuneration. Mark Rose's ground-breaking history of copyright, *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright* (1993), asserts early on and with a great deal of confidence that "Copyright is founded on the concept of the unique individual who creates something original *and is entitled to reap a profit from those labors*."[608]

---

[607] T. S. Eliot to John Quinn, July 9, 1919, *Letters I*, 374.
[608] Mark Rose, *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 2.

(emphasis added). Similarly, Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi, in their edited collection *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature* (1994), identify the conception of "the modern regime of authorship" to have occurred as a result of "the heroic self-presentation of Romantic poets", who propagated the idea that authorship arose from original work "which, accordingly, may be said to be the property of its creator and *to merit the law's protection as such*" (emphasis added).[609] Perhaps the title of Joseph Loewenstein's pre-1710 history of copyright and its origins in the licensing system of the Elizabethan and Caroline ages, *The Author's Due: Printing and the Prehistory of Copyright* (2002), embodies most obviously the now-unquestioned inalienability of an author's copy-rights. Meanwhile Paul K. Saint-Amour's *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (2003) has revealed a more pernicious side to copyright law, in particular in the U.S., in the form of "copyright creep" whereby copyright terms have been extended on up to eleven separate occasions and by as much as twenty years, thus compromising the "social nature of creation" upon which Modernist authors and poets relied.[610]

Still present, however, is the unchallenged axiom that "an author is a person who wins an intangible, temporary, and predominantly alienable property through a highly specific kind of creation, one that society deems sufficiently valuable to *warrant the incentive and reward of exclusive rights*" (emphasis added).[611] Of course, the word "copy*right*" itself promulgates this axiom, as does the fact that we frequently speak of intellectual *rights* and property *rights*. Yet as all the scholars above have attested, the *economic* concept of author as an innate market participant in the print economy originated only after the 1710 Statute of Anne: but, as John Feather has pointed out, "An author's right to be treated as the creator and owner of literary property is not defined in any English statute before the Copyright Act of 1814".[612]

---

[609] Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi, eds., *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994), 2-3.
[610] Paul K. Saint-Amour, *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003), 4-5
[611] Saint-Amour, *The Copywrights*, 3.
[612] John Feather, "From Rights In Copies to Copyright: The Recognition of Authors' Rights in English Law and Practice in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*, eds Woodmansee and Jaszi (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994), 191.

Moreover, any attempt at international alignment in copyright laws to prevent cross-border piracy did not occur until the first meeting of the Berne Convention in 1886.

Yet, until the 1710 Statute of Anne, the evolution of these rights, as a number of scholars have identified, arose from an historical narrative largely immune to any notion of moral or financial obligation to the author as individual.[613] Instead, the process of licensing, which led to the formation of copyright and authorial proprietorship, came about through means of censorship and political structures of control over what were thought to be seditious or subversive writings. In recent years scholars such as Loren Daniel Glass, Celia Marshik, and Allison Pease have begun to attend to Modernism's engagement with obscenity laws, which both offered avenues for subversion as well as posing challenges to the aesthetic appropriation of pornographic tropes.[614] Meanwhile, scholars including Paul Saint-Amour, Robert Spoo, Jay A. Gertzman and Christopher Pollnitz have begun to attend to the complex and fractious relationship between censorship and copyright, in particular with reference to James Joyce and D. H. Lawrence, whose often deliberate confrontations with the censorship laws made them easy prey to pirates and so-called "bookleggers".[615] However, so far these histories have not acknowledged the debt that

---

[613] The 1710 Statute of Anne foregrounded from the start the financial plight of authors who remained unprotected by the monopoly of the printing press, who were in turn systematically reprinting works without compensation to the author. "Whereas printers Booksellers and other persons have of late frequently taken the liberty of printing reprinting and publishing or causing to be printed reprinted and published Books and other writings without the consent of the authors or proprietors of such books and writings to their very great detriment and too often to the Ruin of them and their families." See "Statute of Anne, London (1710)", *Primary Sources on Copyright (1450-1900)*, eds. L. Bently & M. Kretschmer, accessed April 3, 2012. http://copy.law.cam.ac.uk/cam/tools/request/showRecord.php?id=record_uk_1710.

[614] Loren Daniel Glass, "#$%^&*!?: Modernism and Dirty Words." *Modernism/modernity* 14 (April 2007): 209-223; Celia Marshik, *British Modernism and Censorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Allison Pease, *Modernism, Mass Culture, and the Aesthetics of Obscenity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[615] See in particular Chapter 5 Paul Saint-Amour's, *The Copywrights* for a discussion of Joyce's metadiscursive reflection on copyright; Christopher Pollnitz, "The Censorship and Transmission of D. H. Lawrence's Pansies: The Home Office and the 'Foul-Mouthed Fellow'." *Journal of Modern Literature* 28 (Spring 2005): 44-71; Jay A. Gertzman, "Not Quite Honest: Samuel Roth's "Unauthorized" Ulysses and the 1927 International Protest." *Joyce Studies Annual* (2009): 34-66; Robert Spoo, "Copyright Protectionism and Its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's "Ulysses" In America." *The Yale Law Journal* (December 1998): 633-667.

Modernist commentators upon copyright, especially Eliot and Pound, owed to Tudor discourses on literary production, censorship and licensing. This was, in many ways, much more than an attempt to understand a new "modern" era of copyright in relation to its "early modern" predecessor: rather, they were responding to what they saw to be specific inherited traits in twentieth-century copyright, especially in terms of the system of licensing and printing.

The purpose of this chapter is to intervene in the narrative of Modernism's somewhat fraught relationship with copyright, which has recently begun to be excavated by Paul K. Saint-Amour in his 2011 edited collection *Modernism and Copyright*, and to situate Eliot right at the heart of the ongoing exchange between Modernism and copyright law. More specifically, it seeks to redress Eliot's absence from Saint-Amour's history by suggesting that Eliot, though never so provocatively vociferous on the subject as Pound, nevertheless understood that certain tenets which we now hold as axiomatic to Modernism – the tendency towards collaboration, the appropriation and transplantation of (out-of-copyright) classical texts into Modernist productions, or, in response to Pound's call for newness, the production of *original* and authentic works via the translations of such texts – were responsive to, and frequently protected by, the "Modern" copyright law emerging after the 1886 Berne Convention. Indeed, Eliot was not only keenly aware of the "symbioti[c] and antagonisti[c]" relationship between Modernist aesthetics and modern copyright law, but he was also alert to the fact that to understand and mediate between these two concomitant forces meant recognising Modernism's historical contingency upon pre-copyright discourses of ownership.[616]

Eliot's absence from the copyright-Modernism landscape depicted by Saint-Amour is perhaps understandable given his comparatively reticent and non-committal approach to commenting on the frequent confrontations between the two. Unlike Ezra Pound and his little magazine contemporaries, Eliot very rarely spoke or wrote overtly regarding the *political* disparities or obstacles in copyright and obscenity law, which were frequently compromising the proprietorial claims of Modernist authors over their works. Eliot's reticence may also stem, at least in his pre-radio years, from his lack of familiarity with copyright law. Writing as late as May 1927 to Conrad Aiken for clarification on the legal status of "The Hollow Men", which was never published

[616] Saint-Amour, *The Copywrights*, 162.

in the States until Aiken incorporated it into his Anthology, he alludes to the complex differences that formed the cavernous gulf between American and British (and European) copyright law: "Excuse me for troubling you, but American copyright is so puzzling that I need information."[617] Moreover, Eliot was never actively litigious over copyright infringements during his lifetime, despite there being at least one instance where a lawsuit could have been legitimately pursued. Nevertheless, Eliot and his estate was, and continue to be, fiercely protective against infringements and unlicensed reproduction of both his published and unpublished works, and whilst explicit diatribes by Eliot against the penalties imposed upon authors by state copyright mechanisms were rare, they were by no means absent from the narrative that Saint-Amour has begun to carefully reconstruct.

It is significant, therefore, that Eliot chose to meditate on this contingency in his series of lectures on "Six Types of Tudor Prose", broadcast on the radio between June 11 and July 16, 1929. With the establishment of the BBC in 1922, Eliot's ascension to the microphone came relatively late, especially in comparison with other Modernists authors of the period.[618] Whilst both Todd Avery and Michael Coyle have convincingly demonstrated Eliot's sympathy with the Reithian paradigm of broadcasting at the BBC, so far a clear explanation for the timing of Eliot's decision to approach them on his own initiative for a series of talks on Tudor prose has yet to be proffered.[619] Coyle has perhaps come closest to locating the source of Eliot's sudden resolve when he suggests that "Eliot's attraction to the BBC remains inexplicable solely in terms of public self-fashioning or of personal gain. A better account can be made by recovering his sense of the generic differences of a broadcast 'talk' from either a formal lecture or a published essay. In 1929 those differences seemed important, but by 1959 neither Eliot nor the BBC paid them much regard".[620]

---

[617] TSE to Conrad Aiken, May 13, 1927.*Letters III,* 512.
[618] Brief examples include George Bernard Shaw in 1924, Virginia Woolf in July 1927, and E. M. Forster in 1928.
[619] See Chapter 4 of Todd Avery, *Radio Modernism: Literature, Ethics, and the BBC, 1922-1938* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006); Michael Coyle "T. S. Eliot on the Air: 'Culture' and the Challenges of Mass Communication" in *T. S. Eliot and Our Turning World*, ed. Jewel Spears Brooker (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001).
[620] Michael Coyle, "'This Rather Elusory Broadcast Technique': T. S. Eliot and the Genre of the Radio Talk." *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal Of Short Articles, Notes, And Reviews* 11, no. 4 (1998): 2.

Although I would agree with Coyle that Eliot did indeed sharply distinguish between the formal characteristics of a radio broadcast and a spoken lecture, I would argue, however, that in 1929 it was in fact their newly-determined similarity in terms of intellectual property status that marked the turning point in Eliot's public speaking career. By 1931, the BBC, too, had ceased to recognize this distinction between the broadcast and the published text, transforming the newly determined equality between the two forms into monetary terms: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons].[621]

Indeed, the nascent legislation regarding the ownership of broadcast rights agreed upon at the 1928 Rome Conference for amendments to the Berne Convention, coupled with the newborn status of the BBC as a Corporation, made radio a perfect platform for a metadiscursive discussion of copyright: the birth of a new medium and the development of new legislation to protect that medium could converse easily with the rise of the printing press and the creation of the licensing system in the Tudor period. It is the job of the critic, Eliot wrote in 1918, to "brin[g] the art of the past to bear upon the present, making it relevant to the actual generation through his own temperament": it is exactly this method of historically reflexive investigation on Eliot's part that can provide illumination on Modernist notions of authorship and intellectual property.[622]

Typically of Eliot, his broadcasts by no means offer to the uninformed ear a straightforward narrative on copyright's Tudor history, and, over eighty years later, the obliqueness of Eliot's commentary has only increased. Therefore, before attending directly to Eliot's broadcasts, it is pertinent to retrace the development of Eliot's position on copyright legislation prior to the meeting of the Rome Berne Convention in 1928 in order to fully understand both the timing of the broadcasts themselves and the import of radio as the medium by which to transmit these reflections.

4.1 "The American Liberal Varnish": Copyright's Green Card

From an early point in his career, Eliot's engagement with those contemporary conflicts between Modernism and the censorship laws, and within the Modernist

---

[621] C. A. Siepmann to TSE, letter, Febraury 3, 1931 in "T.S. Eliot, Talks: File 1, 1929-1937", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.
[622] Eliot, "Observations." *The Egoist* (May 1918): 70.

project itself on copyright and censorship, was far from peripheral. The negotiations involved in securing the publication in *Poetry Magazine* of "Mr Apollinax" are indicative, one might argue, of the pre-emptive censorship undertaken by the *editors*, in this case Harriet Monroe, to avoid igniting the ire of the state censors and commercial ignominy. Concerned that the line "He laughed like an irresponsible *foetus*" (emphasis added) would provoke the censors (under Section 211 it would constitute a reference to abortion), Monroe agreed to publish the poem only on the condition that the reference was removed. It was a suppression that Eliot found particularly difficult to reconcile, and, in a letter to Quinn two years later in 1918, he complained, "nor do I forget that she expunged, in another poem, a whole line containing the word 'foetus' without asking my permission".[623] Eliot's consternation appears to arise less from the actual expurgation than from Monroe's lack of consultation, suggesting that as early as 1916 he had already begun to cultivate a definitive paradigm of authorship and its associated rights.

Yet, Monroe's unilateral decision as an editor to omit the line also points to the degree of nebulousness over proprietorship of material that underscored the relationship between contributors and editors of the little magazines. This ambiguous relationship, however, whilst appearing to lend itself to the discourses of collaboration which now permeate Modernist scholarship, also highlights how uneasy the interface between modern copyright law and Modernist modes of publication and production actually was. For, as George Bornstein has pointed out, scholarship's tendency to accept the "dissolution of the notion of a single author" must also contend with the absolute rights to ownership of original work conferred upon the author, rights which, at this time, had been ratified in the 1911 Copyright Act in Britain and the 1891 Chace Act in the U.S.[624] Indeed, in competition and at odds with the increasingly interventionist approaches to production assumed not only by the little magazine editors but also by such figures as Ezra Pound, was the desire to capitalise on the

---

[623] TSE to John Quinn, March 4, 1918, *Letters I,* 254.

[624] George Bornstein, "Introduction: Why Editing Matters," in *Representing Modernism Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, ed. George Bornstein (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 3. The Copyright Act 1911 assumed into British law the agreements of the Berne Convention, which conferred rights on international authors. By comparison, the Chace Act offered only limited rights to international authors in comparison to those conferred on American nationals. This decision was underpinned by industrial protectionism, and the agreement to confer copyright to authors was dependent on the printing of work within the US.

now-concretely validated and enfranchised notion of authorship: "The main target of the modernists' editorial labor was often their own art. Their efforts to control the process of textual production involved not only authority over the text itself but also determination of the form in which it appeared to the public and influence over institutions of transmission, whether magazines, anthologies, or entire publishing houses."[625] Monroe's editorial heavy-handedness merely reinforces this conflict: whilst in a kinder light Monroe's cutting of the line might be seen as a collaborative act in what was beginning to seem to be an increasingly collaborative aesthetic project, the elimination of an entire line, rather than simply the offending word, does more than undercut the author: it changes the form of the poem – rhythmically and structurally – as well as compromising the holistic approach to interpretation so favoured by Eliot. In essence, the integrity of the poem as an original piece of *finished* work could be challenged by editorial intervention in a way that other works of art could not, disrupting the legal autonomy of the author to control the afterlife of his creation.

For all Eliot's indignation at having his authorial autonomy challenged, he was nevertheless alert to the often-inimical yet indissoluble helix of copyright and censorship. Monroe may have undermined Eliot's control over the final form of his work, but her pre-emptive censorship actually ensured that "Mr Apollinax" could be copyrighted. A decade later, and faced with a genuine case of infringement involving Samuel Roth's "pirating" of *Sweeney Agonistes* in *Two Worlds Monthly*, Eliot was able to write to Syliva Beach with some confidence that "So far as I know, nothing that I have written has been excluded from the mails or officially suppressed or reproved in any other way in America".[626] This case will be discussed in more detail below, but it is worth noting that Monroe's vigilant editorship meant that by avoiding the censors and securing the printing of the poem in the U.S., American copyright for the poem had at least been ensured, a fact that would become increasingly important in early 1918 when Quinn suspected that Boni and Liveright, the eventual U.S. publishers of *The Waste Land*, were planning to produce an unauthorised edition of

[625] Bornstein, "Introduction: Why Editing Matters", 2, 3.
[626] TSE to Sylvia Beach, December 15, 1926, *Letters III*, 342.

Prufrock and Other Observations (1917).[627] It was such an editorial tightrope that Eliot himself would later have to navigate, as Rachel Potter has observed, when confronted by quandary of having to protect the legal interests of Faber and Faber and the artistic interests of his authors[628].

Although the claims were proven to be groundless, Eliot's vigilance over censorship and infringement appears to have been put on high alert, more so since the suppression of Wyndham Lewis's *Cantleman's Spring Mate*. Lewis's short story, which depicts the degradation of a young male soldier into sexual depravity (resulting in his impregnating a young English girl) and the strong sexual undercurrents of violence in the trenches, was, not surprisingly perhaps, banned under Section 211 for obscenity, a decision upheld by the rather more sympathetic Judge Hand. Pound wanted not only to name and shame Section 211 by printing it alongside Anderson's defence of the story in the December 1917 issue of *The Little Review*, but also to reprint Hand's own indictment of the censorship laws.[629] Curiously, however, Pound was initially reluctant to offer his own account of the case, writing to Quinn in December 1917, "If it weren't for the war, I should probably print some account of

---

[627] Eliot wrote to Quinn March 4, 1918 to "more particularly to express my gratitude to you for your activity on my behalf against the Pirates". See *Letters I,* 252. Pound, too, expressed his alarm and disbelief at the potential infringement, but, as his letter to Quinn in February 1918 reveals, "that shister Boni" would "get damn well stuck" owing to the fact that only two poems from the collection, "Rhapsody on a Windy Night" and "Preludes", were never printed on U.S. soil: "That is enough to hold up Boni's little game, I believe." See Ezra Pound to John Quinn, February 22, 1918, *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn 1915-1924*, ed. Materer, 143.

[628] Rachel Potter, "Censorship," in *T. S. Eliot in Context,* ed. Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 86. Potter flags Eliot's own editorial decisions to request that Djuna Barnes remove or replace the words 'bugger' and 'pubic hair' from *Nightwood* and that Auden eliminate 'the fucked hen' from *The Orators*. Potter, however, makes a strong case for Eliot's 'lifelong interest in literary obscenity', noting his public support for Joyce and Lewis, as well as for Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness*. As the recent publication of the third and fourth volume of Eliot's letters attest, however, such support was frequently not without reservation.

[629] Margaret Anderson, "Judicial Opinion (Our Suppressed October Issues)." *The Little Review* 4, no. 8 (December, 1917): 46-48. In his final summation of the case, Hand was openly critical of the obscenity laws, which, he thought, gave greater protection and preference to the "classics", whose status as literature was protected by "age and fame". By this account, the static and concrete nature of the law meant that obscenity penalties were being applied without any understanding of the canon as a fluid, organic, and constantly evolving cultural product, often prejudicially, and without understanding of Modernism's own dialogue with such classics.

the matter in the Egoist. I don't know that it is worth doing *now*. The text of the law re/instruments, literature and the products of M. le Docteur Condom, etc. is really too compromising to the nation to print during Armageddon".[630] Whether this statement was intended to appease Quinn at this point, who was becoming increasingly frustrated by what he saw to be Pound's unrealistic attempts to change the obscenity laws, is unclear: but in March 1918 accounts of the case appeared simultaneously in the *The Little Review* by Pound and in *The Egoist* by Eliot. Pound's invective against "the amazing, grotesque, and unthinkable, ambiguous law of our country" is shot through with a barely-disguised scorn and ridicule of the legal system, whose glacial and retroactive approach to canonisation was not only disabling the aesthetic principles of Modernism, where the masters of the past were effacing those of the present, but was also profoundly undemocratic and politically censorial: "Our hundred and twenty millions of inhabitants desire their literature sifted for them by one individual selected without any examination of his literary qualifications."[631]

Eliot's account of the case, by contrast, is manifestly less emotive and vituperative. Seemingly informative rather than interrogative, "Literature and the American Courts" "merely offers for the perusal of our readers the text of the curious law under which judgment was given" in a move that echoed the editorial agenda of *The Little Review* at that time.[632] Although Eliot's article appears to be decidedly non-committal on the subject, he does in fact seize upon and foreground the fragile economic relationship between censorship and publication, whilst directing attention to the at once interdependent and conflicting economic and aesthetic objectives within the Modernist project itself. Indeed, in what is one of Eliot's rare public and explicit accounts of the politics of copyright, he highlights, by "pass[ing] over", the issue of the financial repercussions to the *Little Review*, and therefore to its contributors, of the censorship laws: "the financial loss from the suppression of an issue of three thousand

---

[630] Ezra Pound to John Quinn, December 29, Materer, 132.
[631] Ezra Pound, "The Classics 'Escape." *The Little Review* 5, no. 2 (March 1918): 34. For a more detailed assessment of Pound's battle with the censors see Matthew Hofer's "Modernist Polemic: Ezra Pound v. 'the perverters of language'", *Modernism/modernity* 9 (September 2002): 463-489. The anonymous philistine-censor characterised by Pound, however, evokes a much older system of literary suppression. Throughout the Tudor period, licensing was granted by such amorphous institutions as the Crown, the Privy Council, the Stationers' Company, The Lord Chamberlain's Office (up to as recently as 1968), and the Master and Wardens.
[632] Eliot, "Literature and the American Courts." *The Egoist* 5, no. 3 (March 1918): 39.

copies to a review which without subsidy is struggling quite alone in America to obtain and publish only contemporary work of the finest literary quality".[633] For Lawrence Rainey, it was the publication of *The Waste Land* that signalled a "crucial moment in the transition of modernism from a minority culture to one supported by an important institutional and financial apparatus."[634] Yet the recognition that literary Modernism would require more robust economic scaffolding was clearly on Eliot's mind five years earlier. He seemed to recognise that it was the "minority" status of this culture that was at once defining its originality whilst laying the dynamite for its self-destruction. International authors were particularly dependent on the publication of their work within the U.S. in order to secure copyright and prevent piracy, but this copyright was dependent on the co-operation of the contributors with the demands of the censors, who in turn could jeopardise the financial standing of Modernist journals. Ultimately, the "volatile and contradictory" publication dynamics of Modernism meant that the onus for the continued existence of these magazines, for the securement of copyright, lay, not surprisingly, with the authors themselves.[635] Joyce's *Ulysses* may well have been "transgressing moral and ideological boundaries" in a bid to "disturb social, sexual, and aesthetic complacencies", as Robert Spoo has argued, but as John Quinn recognised with regards Wyndham Lewis's *Cantleman's Spring Mate*, such blatant flouting of the censorship laws was tantamount to "political naiveté."[636] It was, in short, a case of cutting one's nose to spite one's face. There was much, wrote Eliot to Eleanor Hinkley in 1918, that was "offensively aggressive" about *The Little Review*, and Eliot recognised that the self-publishing, self-printing ideal proposed by Pound simply could not withstand the demands Modernism was making on itself.[637]

What was needed instead was the weight of a much mightier publishing powerhouse, whether in the form of an independent printing press such as that initiated by the Woolfs, or by establishing oneself at the heart of an already-reputable publishing firm. At Faber and Gwyer, as Jason Harding notes, he could use the "gravitation pull of his presence" to attract, and in some cases lure, his

---

[633] Eliot, "Literature and the American Courts", 39.
[634] Lawrence Rainey, *Revisiting* The Waste Land (New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 86.
[635] Rainey, *Revisiting* The Waste Land, 72.
[636] Timothy Materer, ed., "The End of an Era, 1918," in Materer, 138.
[637] TSE to Eleanor Hinkley, April 1 1918, *Letters I*, 260.

contemporaries away from other firms, whilst nurturing his progeny of late modernism – whom he referred to paternally as "'my own younger authors"' – including, most famously, Auden and Spender.[638]

As an editor at Faber, however, Eliot's position in relation to copyright and censorship became more complicated. Where he was now in the position to influence and shape the Modernist canon to some degree, the financial and legal practicalities of being an employee of a large publishing firm meant that any attempt to both market Modernist works and, importantly, to openly challenge, question and interrogate copyright legislation necessitated a medium that could diffuse such commentary. With *The Criterion* Eliot could both mediate the conversation on copyright-related issues whilst avoiding the openly maverick stance adopted by Pound. Indeed, *The Criterion*, in many ways, was Eliot's most successful collaborative project if judging by ends and means. Writing to his mother in June 1926, he relishes being at the epicentre of Britain and Europe's intellectual network, whilst being in the position "to choose the right people and then let them write almost anything they wish to write – and I think that most of the men who write for the *Criterion* do their best work for it".[639] Eliot's confidence here, however, belies how directorial his role actually was in shaping the *Criterion*'s conversations, whilst the recent publication of his letters from between 1926 and 1929 serve only to further illuminate just how intensively involved Eliot was in both the reading and soliciting of reviews and articles. Herbert Howarth put the point more forcefully in 1959 when he argued that the periodical reflected Eliot's "irremediable ambition to pursue and cry a conviction, to be a preacher, a Savonarola (his mother's hero), and to change the world".[640] This perhaps overstates the case slightly, but I want to suggest that the *Criterion* did indeed lay the foundations and provide the discursive environment for Eliot's first set of radio broadcasts, many of which directly engage with both the scholarship in New Bibliography studies, which found its way into the pages of *The Criterion,* and key

---

[638] Jason Harding ,"Publishing", in Harding (2011), 76-77; Eliot quoted in Ronald Schuchard, "T. S. Eliot at Fabers: Book Reports, Blurbs, Young Poets." *Areté* (Summer/Autumn 2007): 67.
[639] TSE to his Mother, June 13, 1926, *Letters III*, 187.
[640] Herbert Howarth, "T. S. Eliot's Criterion: The Editor and His Contributors." *Comparative Literature*11, no. 2 (Spring, 1959): 97. Howarth further reflected that "I doubt whether anyone has been so resolved as Eliot to have his own periodical and control it purposefully."

copyright-infringement cases which arose in the years preceding the broadcasts in 1929.

4.2 New Bibliography Studies and Modern Copyright

"And only in historical perspective can we form any opinion as to what is going on", announced Eliot in a lecture entitled "Tradition and the Practice of Poetry" in Dublin in 1936.[641] Such a nod to hindsight must surely have had some resonance with those members of the audience who recalled that, nearly a decade earlier in 1927, the Irish Senate had been entangled in negotiations to make amendments to the Industrial and Commercial Property Protection Bill, the act designed to fill the copyright void that emerged following Eire's successful bid for Home Rule. Of the most controversial of these amendments was the proposal that any author-citizen of the Irish Free State wishing to secure copyright there must first publish and, importantly, *print* their work within the new Irish State. For Senator William Butler Yeats, such defiant protectionism would not only directly contravene the conditions of the Berne Convention (to which Eire, under British dominion, had agreed), but would have devastating consequences for scholars reliant on the authority and influence of long-established British university presses. The effects, moreover, would be equally felt by "creative writers" for whom the pragmatics of making a living necessitated publication with larger British presses, with few, argued Yeats, endowed with the authority to condition publishers on the locale of the printers for their works. By indelibly linking copyright to discourses of patriotism and national identity, what would ensue, he warns, would be the enforced exportation by the Irish Free State of its own authors disenfranchised by the state mechanisms of copyright. In conditioning its own author-citizens to print in their homeland, "You will not be moving from a condition of piracy, but towards it, and you will bring upon your head an amount of obloquy of which you have no idea."

It was about this time in 1927 that Eire's most notorious self-exile, James Joyce, was himself engaged in a bitter litigious and now well-documented copyright dispute with Samuel Roth over the *Two Worlds* printing of *Ulysses*. The copyright infringement of *Ulysses*, claimed Yeats, was indicative of the danger of state-

---

[641] Eliot, "Tradition and the Practice of Poetry," in *T. S. Eliot. Essays from the* Southern Review, ed. James Olney (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 11.

sanctioned piracy caused by enforced domestic printing, and the United States, with its similar and no-less protectionist proviso that copyright for written works could only be secured by printing on US soil, was itself setting such a precedent. Yeats may have invoked Joyce's plight in his speeches to the Senate, but he had reasons of his own to articulate these concerns. Indeed, in April 1927, Yeats's solicitors appear to have written to Eliot to request a delay of the publication of his poem "The Tower" in *The Criterion*. Eliot's response reveals Yeats, too, had fallen prey to the U.S. copyright law, where, unable to secure printing and publication of the poem in the U.S. he was forced to write to Eliot to postpone the UK printing of the poem, which, under U.S. copyright law and in the absence of near simultaneous publication in both countries, would have effectively voided the poem's copyright there, exposing it to pirates such as Roth.[642] Eliot, whilst sympathetic in his response, reveals the extent of his business acumen and purposeful control of the periodical: explaining that the proofs had already been drawn up and that, unusually, a considerable number of pages had been reserved for Yeats's lengthy poem, Eliot was forced to conclude that, given the fragile financial and circulatory position of the new monthly edition of the periodical, "I am obliged as editor to put the interests of my review first".[643]

Eliot's response strikes one at first glance as an attitude of un-collegial hard-nosedness: in reality, however, Eliot's stance is indicative of the evolving status of the

---

[642] See Howarth, 97.

[643] See TSE to Messrs A. P. Watt and Son, April 29, 1927, *Letters III,* 489-90; TSE to W. B. Yeats, May 13, 1927, *Letters III,* 515-516. Eliot instead invited Yeats to contribute a "protest" against American copyright law, whilst he himself issued a commentary on the situation in the July issue of *The Criterion*. Although it would appear that Yeats never contributed his own commentary on American copyright law, Eliot wrote one of his most severest indictments against American copyright in response:

> Here is a matter which touches closely anyone who publishes a book, or even a periodical article, in Great Britain. Yet here, perhaps, we may find our ray of hope deceptive. The Institute does not 'in any way concern itself with the private relations of one nation to another'. (In this it seems more cautious than the League itself, which undoubtedly concerned itself with the private relations of Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands). So that if this problem proves a ticklish one it will probably be referred to the 'private relations' of Great Britain and America. Yet the present American Copyright Law is a flagrant injustice to British and still more to Irish writers, and one of the first particulars to which 'International Intellectual Co-operation' should be directed.

See Eliot, "A Commentary" in *The Monthly Criterion* Vol. VI, No. 1 (July 1927): 3.

author-paradigm. The post-War growth in the number of publishing houses meant that the position and function of the author was rapidly becoming less associated with a person of the leisured class than with someone capable of diversifying beyond the library walls. Eliot himself was, and is, frequently figured as poet, critic, and editor, but that remit of authorship to which he frequently reverted also encompassed broadcaster, public speaker, university lecturer, and committee membership and advisory roles. In short, authorship had become a profession that had exceeded both social and economic boundaries, and, in doing so, had acquired an entirely new set of responsibilities. In 1927,

> The typical professional author is – or is supposed to be – an unpractical, unbusinesslike, unorganised individual, anxious, above all, that the book to which he has devoted so much labour should be read. What chance has this unworldly ninny in striking a bargain with an astute, urbane, commercial-minded man?[644]

Since the publication of Lawrence Rainey's *Institutions of Modernism* (1998), Modernist scholarship has widely embraced the convincing evidence put forward by the author regarding, in particular, Pound's determination and belief in the contingent relationship between commercial success or the marketability of Modernist works and the recognition of those works as embodying "a significant idiom."[645] Yet, with the professionalization of authorship, the point at which authors were expected to become complicit in this network, according to Eliot, began long before material was solicited by or proffered to publishers. The onus was increasingly being put upon the author, even before ink met paper, to survey the economic landscape of literature and the international systems of copyright.

This was especially the case for those authors either anticipating publication in the U.S. or else wary of piracy, where careful timetabling of publication was required to secure copyright in the States. Charles Dickens's infamous and prolonged fight with the American "pirates" became a point in case of "professional" authors having both to reassess their role in protecting their own works and being proactive in ensuring that protection, and it is perhaps not simply a matter of coincidence that Eliot should return to Wilkie Collins and Dickens in the *TLS* in October 1927, just four

---

[644] Editor of "The Nation", "Books and the Public," in *Books and the Public*, The Editor of *The Nation* et al. (London: The Hogarth Press, 1927), 10.
[645] Rainey, *Institutions of Modernism*, 85.

months after a very public spat with Samuel Roth over the "unauthorised" reprinting of *Sweeney Agonistes*.[646] "It is possible," writes Eliot, "that the artist can be too conscious of his 'art'" at the expense of its marketability: artists needed to develop an altogether more holistic understanding of their works as products within a nexus between social developments in education and literacy, wealth, and leisure time, and the way in which these factors affected the publishing market, which in turn unavoidably affected the social and professional status of authorship itself. The 1911 Copyright Act may have, in academic terms, "provide[d] a statutory hedge against industrial concerns around an author's somewhat mysterious, if not mystified, creative act … [and] enable[d] a bracketing, a willed forgetting, of the marketplace", but the author could not in reality afford to dislocate himself from the prevailing economic and social conditions to which the publishing industry was subject. Indeed, the concluding paragraphs of "Wilkie Collins and Dickens" betray a deep unease regarding the perceived decline in a reading public: "The greatest novels have something in them which will ensure their being read, at least by a small number of people, even if the novel, as a literary form, ceases to be written." However, "[s]o long as novels are written" it was vital that authors developed a prescient sense of the market into which they were entering: "We cannot afford to forget that the first – and not one of the least difficult – requirements of either prose or verse is that it should be interesting."[647] If Eliot's comments seem almost banal to a modern Murdoch generation, they were certainly in tune with the rather urgent and abundant commentaries emerging from publishers and the National Book Council at that time. As one such commentator put it,

> This was an age in which people had little leisure hours for book reading, and such leisure hours as they had were spent in numerous ways other than book reading. By the time a great many people had read their newspapers, listened to wireless programmes, motored down to the seaside for the weekend, and

---

[646] For more intensive discussions of Dickens's fight with the American "pirates" see Gerhard Joeseph, "Charles Dickens, International Copyright, and the Discretionary Silence of *Martin Chuzzlewit,*" in *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*, ed. Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994), 259-270; Ivan Kreilkampf, *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
[647] Eliot, "Wilkie Collins and Dickens." *The Times Literary Supplement* (August 4, 1927): 525.

> filled in their other evenings in a picture house or a dance hall, what time was there left for book reading?[648]

Despite the notoriety attached to such high-profile cases as the copyright infringement of *Ulysses*, where censorship could be seen to clearly patrol the gates of copyright, there were still those, such as R. B. McKerrow who would deny their coexistence. In *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*, published in 1927, McKerrow claimed in a section entitled "A Miscellany and Author's Rights" that "Copyright and censorship have really nothing to whatever to do with one another[.] …What we now term 'copyright', namely, the *author's* right in his work is quite another matter, entirely independent of official control".[649] Ironically, however, one of the methods of sustaining literature as a viable and valued commodity was in the co-dependent relationship between copyright and censorship. Indeed, censorship played an important economic role in the literary marketplace of ensuring the primacy of literature at a time when audio-visual technologies were beginning to encroach on the leisure time of the reading public. The suppression of Radcliffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* (1928) serves as an exemplar as to how censorship, with the help of public outrage, could reaffirm both the public's investment in maintaining literature as a valued component of the economic and cultural fabric of the nation. As reported in *The Criterion* in September 1928, Hall's novel gained the attention of the censor through public condemnation in the press:

> But there the matter would probably have stopped, but for the prompt action of the editor of the *Sunday Express*. This gentleman found the book to be a menace to morality; and instead of bringing it privately to the notice of the Home Office, gave it a generous advertisement by public denunciation in his own columns.[650]

The *Sunday Express* was a populist newspaper that catered to the lower and lower-middle classes, for whom leisure was a scarce resource. The indictment against *The Well of Loneliness*, rather than alienating this demographic from "literature", actually reasserted their connection to, and understanding of, literary works as respected

---

[648] "Book Trade and Public: Is Reading Less Popular?" *The Observer*, 3rd June, 1928.
[649] Ronald B. McKerrow *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Intro. David McKitterick (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies; New Castle and Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 1994): 142.
[650] Eliot, "A Commentary." *The Criterion* 8, no. 30 (September, 1928): 1.

cultural and moral markers. In essence, by inciting outrage, the editor of the *Sunday Express* merely reiterated literature's pivotal role in the social and economic make-up of Britain to a demographic widely feared to be dissociating itself from the literary altogether.

It was a point that had not gone unnoticed by Eliot, who by 1935, was cautiously confirming how censorship could dismantle the micro-economies of pornography, thereby protecting the larger publishing houses and bookshops who traded in high-cultural commodities:

> 'Under the present state of affairs it is rather safer to publish a book which deals pleasantly with vice than a book which makes it repulsive. In publishing a book which may be highly moral, but which offends the prejudices of a magistrate no one can be sure what the penalty may be.
>
> 'Much as I dislike this state of affairs I cannot regard with equanimity the absence of any such control. I regret to say that there is such a thing as pornographic literature. Whatever one thinks of periodicals in little shops or some novels in big shops, if there were no risks in publishing things would probably be a very great deal worse.'[651]

Eliot's concerns with the decline of a reading public, however, did not stem simply from professional anxieties over profits and the future of his own publishing house: it is very likely that he was cognisant of the historical and social conditions and factors that allowed for the piracy epidemic to spread in an age when authors were almost certainly the most vulnerable to such a "crime" – the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This was an era when the vast majority was far from literate; it was predominantly an oral and auditory cultural age, and it is for this reason that discourses on censorship and copyright principally oriented around the theatre. The growth in the number of licensed theatre companies, who commissioned or bought their plays for production, accompanied the growth in the theatre-going public and the infamous lust for spectacle at the Jacobean court. The inevitable result of these developments, of course, was that the play manuscripts, the performances of which were considered to be the sole right of the stage company who bought them (providing they registered the play with The Stationer's Company), themselves

---

[651] "Book Censorship: Mr. T. S. Eliot on the Need for Some Control" *The Manchester Guardian*, July 10, 1935.

assumed greater significance, becoming valuable commodities in their own right. Even in the local, or what we might term the micro-economy, of Renaissance theatre, value, copyright, and censorship only emerge as culturally-determinate forces when texts, or manuscripts, are assigned an intrinsic value by the wider public.

Faced with the threat, as the above commentator perceived it, of the audio-visual creep of cinema, radio, and the phonograph, it is perhaps unsurprising that critics were looking back to similar historical moments of orality to understand the oral technologies of the present and their deleterious effects on the printed word.[652] Despite Edison's pitching of the phonograph as a device that could in fact "protect their [author's] works from being stolen by means of defective copyright laws", there was considerable unease amongst the publishing community that both broadcasting and the phonograph could usurp the commercial position of the written word.[653] Indeed, in June 1936 (just six months following the broadcast of *Murder in the Cathedral*) at the International Publishers' Congress, Geoffrey Faber expressed concerned that a saturated broadcasting schedule might lead to programmes dedicated to the rendering of the written word. Anxious at the prospect that gramophone companies were preparing to launch "talking books", Faber envisioned that "The first books to be exploited would be non-copyright books, but the copyright field would soon be invaded[.]" Faber, it seems, was not alone in his concerns regarding the encroaching of the oral upon the written word, the congress subsequently passing a resolution that publishers and authors should be permitted to control the means by which the written word could be reproduced.[654]

---

[652] By 1940, according to one survey, only 24 per cent of working-class adults were buying books, whilst only 16 per cent were members of libraries, although concerns about declining readership and discussions on the function of local libraries frequently appeared in national newspapers already in the years immediately after World War One. See Jonathan Rose "Modernity and Print I: Britain 1890-1970," in *A Companion to the History of the Book*, ed. Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 347. Concerns regarding the correlation between reading habits and literacy were also high on the agenda following the 1921 Newbolt Report, which highlighted the cultural and social imperative of teaching English literature and elocution within schools as a method of civilising the "barbarian" elements of society. See Chapter 6 of Tony Crowley's *Standard English and the Politics of Language* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

[653] Thomas A. Edison. "The Perfected Phonograph" *The North American Review* Vol. 146, No. 379 (June, 1888): 647.

[654] "Talking Books: Effect on Rights of Publishers" *The Times,* June 10, 1936.

Such a climate of distrust regarding oral dissemination of the written word could be reconstituted – or rather was prefigured – in the "hybrid character" of drama, as Andrew Pettegree defines it, in the early sixteenth century. Able to fluidly migrate across textual and oral boundaries of dissemination – from manuscript to performance to (edited) published text – drama spoke to a generation of critics and authors (not least Eliot himself) who found their works emulating this pattern in broadcasting. Indeed, such an uneven landscape of transmutation could hardly provide firm foundations for the more rigid and immoveable structures of copyright.[655] The bibliographical scholarship undertaken by A. W. Pollard was indicative of such attempts to determine how to protect the copyright of literary texts when in the process of transmutation – those spaces between which the text moves from having a physical form to oral to physical again, or even in the transmutations that takes place in text-to-text translation. Pollard's *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*, published in 1909 (followed by his *Shakespeare's Fight With the Pirates* in 1917), were landmark critical texts in the birth of the twentieth century's earliest form of literary historicism, the New Bibliography[656]. Literary studies soon became saturated by New Bibliographical accounts, which sought to interrogate the authenticity of manuscripts from the Renaissance and the reception of subsequent printings of these manuscripts as authoritative versions (in particular, of course, those of Shakespeare and Ben Jonson), whilst assembling a history of authorship and intellectual property from this period.[657]

Eliot was clearly following this new line of thought in literary historicism, and was in fact reviewing and assessing the adequacy of these accounts and their

---

[655] Andrew Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010): 346.

[656] For an excellent account of the New Bibliography, see Chapter 1 of Gabriel Egan's *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[657] A small selection of contemporary books on copyright and bibliographical study include: "Booksellers, Printers, and the Stationers' Trade" by R. B. McKerrow in *Shakespeare's England Vol. II*. (1916); A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text* (1917); R. B. McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography* (1927); A. S. Collins, *Authorship in the Days of Johnson: Being a Study of the Relation Between Author, Patron, Publisher, and Public, 1726-1780* (1927); Evelyn M. Albright's *Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640* (1927); *The Profession of Letters: A Study of the Relation of Author to Patron, Publisher, and Public, 1780-1832* (1928); and Cyril B. Judge's *Elizabethan Book-Pirates* (1934)

methodologies. In his favorable 1928 review of Percy Allen's *Shakespeare, Jonson and Wilkins as Borrowers: A Study in Elizabethan Dramatic Origins and Imitations*, Eliot quotes the main premise of Allen's argument that "'All men, whether writers or no, must borrow'", "'progress'" having been established through the "'process of age-long, multitudinous, accumulated loans and adaptations from our progenitors'".[658] Allen's thesis, however, directly echoes (albeit without acknowledgement) the arguments Eliot himself put forward in a lecture on George Chapman at Cambridge University in 1924. Although never published, there is a remarkable, and rather ironic, intersectioning between Eliot's and Allen's notions of the indebted artist. Like Allen, Eliot seizes on the proclivity in literary criticism to proceed, Alice-like, down the rabbit warren of literary sources:

> This paper should have started by an examination of Chapman's sources—the writers who influenced him—a sifting of what he borrowed in order to show you what was indubitably his own. What was merely borrowed from Stoic or other philosophy? What ideas, if any, had he actually lived into and made his own? The Elizabethans are often, individually, praised for what they borrowed, or for what are mere commonplaces of the time; and their true originality as often, overlooked.[659]

Noticeable here is that the responsibility to divulge the sources of Chapman's "borrowing" is conferred not upon Chapman, but upon the critic, the lynx of literary provenance. If Eliot is responding to a perception of the Elizabethans as uniquely prone to literary borrowings from within a new wave of writers not "praised" but criticized for a like methodology, this lecture sought to foreground the "mind which is personal", which is not "shared" or "derived" from contemporary individuals or schools of thought.

If Chapman's mind was marked by "internal incoherence, as of an era of transition and decay", and if "he represents not re-birth but decomposition", Modernism, in contrast, could perhaps fulfill the generative potential, the fertilizing possibility, of the components of decomposition: it could, unlike Chapman and

---

[658] Eliot, "Poets' Borrowings." *TLS* (April 5, 1928): 255.
[659] T. S. Eliot. "A Neglected Aspect of Chapman", ed. Anthony Cuda and Ronald Schuchard. *The New York Review of Books* November 7, 2013. Accessed 23 February, 2014. http://0-www.nybooks.com.lib.exeter.ac.uk/articles/archives/2013/nov/07/neglected-aspect-chapman/html.

Dostoevski, "realise life in accordance with the mind." Allen, evidently echoing Eliot's own presentiments on the author's debt to the past and the acknowledgement of the unbaiting presence of that past, also makes a point which is seized upon by Eliot as an intervention in the narrative of appropriation of/in the literary tradition.

> To our mind, the most important point that Mr. Allen makes is the borrowing of writers from themselves. The debt of every poet to his predecessors and contemporaries is a scent eagerly sniffed and followed by every critic; but the debts of poets to their own earlier work are apt to be overlooked. Yet any intelligent psychologist ought to see at once that any poet, even the greatest, will tend to use his own impressions over and over again. It is by no means a matter of poverty of inspiration. Every man who writes poetry has a certain number of impressions and emotions which are particularly important to him.[660]

Here, the author of *The Waste Land*, the notes to which were intended as a means of "spiking the guns of critics of my earlier poems who had accused me of plagiarism", calls forth the regenerative potential of authorial experience and its material: "impressions".[661] The careful negation of "poverty" in this passage recasts the poet in the role of property-owner, the proprietor, as well has as inhabitant, of one's own experience to which one also has the right to re-invoke and recalibrate such phenomena into original material. A poet's "impressions and emotions" become, in one sense, the ur-text for the poet's published material, its poetic offspring the result of the resetting of the original.

In addition to Eliot's reviews, *The Criterion* provided a critical and public forum for these discussions on literary heredity and copyright, whilst flagging up a symbiotic relationship between Elizabethan and Tudor discourses on censorship and piracy and those invectives against censorship and copyright infringement frequently voiced by those central to the Modernist project. "The Mystery of the *Hamlet* First Quarto" by W. J. Lawrence was published in the *Monthly Criterion* in May 1927, just a month after Yeats's letter to Eliot regarding *The Tower* and the same month in which Roth published *Sweeney Agonistes* in *Two Worlds* without authorisation.

---

[660] Eliot, "Poets' Borrowings", 255.

[661] Eliot, "The Frontiers of Criticism", 533. This lecture took place less than a year after the implementation of copyright law agreed upon at the Universal Copyright Convention in August 1955.

Lawrence's article seeks to reinforce the conclusion drawn by Pollard that the Q1 (First Quarto) of *Hamlet* – repeatedly alluded to as that "spurious text" – was a pirated edition taken in large part from its precursor of doubtful authorship; the *Ur-Hamlet*. Q1, according to Lawrence, was fused together from a number of different texts and prompt books of the same or related story, and not left unmarked by the creative efforts of "the hack" himself. What is crucial, however, is that whilst Lawrence outlines a case for the Q1's large debt to the *Ur-Hamlet*, errors in the text can likewise be attributed to the neglectful efforts of the transcriber of the authoritative production by Shakespeare. For this deception, Lawrence casts the burden of guilt onto the Elizabethan publishers, who, "in throwing dust into the eyes of the contemporary play-reader", committed "fraud". Commentators and critics, he argues, were complicit in the crime, by participating in the deception that the Q1 was merely the precursor to a revised (and authoritative) Q2, and therefore were equally guilty of committing a "libel" against Shakespeare: "it is not," he claims, "as if they were wholly ignorant of the tricks of the Elizabethan publishing trade."[662]

Yet these accusations of fraudulent and libellous behaviour stem from constructions of authorship and intellectual property in a post-Berne Convention age. In particular, they emerge out of the UK Copyright Act of 1911, which codified the principles of copyright laid out in Berlin Berne Convention in 1909, but which, more importantly, accorded equal copyright status to unpublished and published works: instead of copyright being acquired through registration and licensing, as had been the common law practice for the previous four hundred years, copyright was automatically conferred on the text and to the author at the point of creation.[663] As Eliot's second broadcast on "The Elizabethan Grub Street" would reveal, however, Lawrence's assessment is flawed by his (and others') palimpsestic tendency to apply post-Berne Convention concepts of authorship and copyright to a group of authors

---

[662] W. J. Lawrence "The Mystery of the *Hamlet* First Quarto" in *The Monthly Criterion* vol. 5, no. 2 (May 1927): 191-201. It was a theme to which Lawrence would return two years later in "The Pirates of 'Hamlet'" in *The Criterion,* vol. 8, no. 33 (July 1929): 642-646.

[663] Transatlantic disputes over copyright, however, were frequently a direct result of the U.S.'s refusal to sign up to the Berne Convention. As Paul Saint-Amour has argued, the U.S. "with its entrenched copyright exceptionalism and its industrial view of literary production' meant that copyright law was implemented "unilateral[ly]." See Saint-Amour, "Introduction: Modernism and the Lives of Copyright," in *Modernism and Copyright*, 7.

and playwrights for whom such ideas were nigh-inconceivable. Indeed, the "hack" to which Lawrence derogatively refers was to Eliot the creative precursor to that "greater genius: Daniel Defoe."[664] The assembling of the Q1 from a variety of sources and by a variety of means, moreover, could very well be perceived as a collaborative and creative piece of work in its own right, as Eliot's own *Waste Land* could testify. Moreover, the 1911 Copyright Act did not define the term "literary work" as having anything to do with ideas or even style: "Copyright protection is given not to ideas but to literary forms, and information will not be protected unless it is expressed in an original form."[665] The Q1, despite "borrowing" the basic plot of the *Hamlet* Q2, could be legitimately considered, according to 1911 law, an original piece of work, fragments shored against the ruins. Speaking in 1936, Eliot asserted that "The perpetual task of poetry is to *make all things new*. Not necessarily to make new things. It is always partly a revolution, or a reaction, from the work of the previous generation".[666] Yet if Q1 could be constructed piecemeal from both textual and auditory sources, registered with the Stationer's Company, and published under the name of Shakespeare, authorship itself could be perceived not only as malleable and amorphous, but also as divorced from the "personality" of the author. Seen in a more pernicious light, however, it relinquishes Shakespeare, the individual, in Stephen Greenblatt's terms, of any "autonomy": "the power to impose a shape upon oneself is an aspect of the more general power to control identity".[667]

In the 1920s, a declining readership coupled with the competition from audio-visual technologies of cultural dissemination meant that, in order to convince the public of the value of literature – to maintain literature's "function" as a commodity –

---

[664] T. S. Eliot. "The Elizabethan Grub Street" *The Listener* 1, no. 23 (June 19, 1929): 1.

[665] George Haven Putnam, "Copyright," in *The Encyclopedia Britannica. Fourteenth Ed. Vol. 6 "Olebrooke to Damascus"* (New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1929): 414.

[666] Eliot, "Tradition and the Practice of Poetry", 876.

[667] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 1. Shakespeare himself, one could argue, explores this early modern identity theft in *Measure for Measure*. The recurring allusions to the counterfeiting and substitution of identity foreground how the fluidity of identity has the potential to subvert institutions of power, allusions which metadiscursively engage with the economic ramifications of counterfeiting at a time when it was considered to be a state crime punishable by death.

and therefore to protect its entitlement to copyright, authorship not only had to embody the polyphonous roles of lecturer, public speaker, reciter, and so on, but it also had to be physically "embodied". This idea was not new, stemming, as Stephen Dobranksi has shown, from changes to the economic dynamics of print and publishing in the mid-seventeenth-century: "With the demise of patronage and the rise of a market system that rewarded literary compositions as labor, the originality and thus value of a work was predicated on the existence of a visible author".[668] Modernists, as Jonathan Goldman has recently shown, not only engaged with an emerging celebrity culture, but actively courted and exploited it to their own financial ends.[669] Indeed, the infamous 14,000-strong audience that gathered at the University of Minnesota's football stadium in 1956 to hear Eliot deliver a lecture on "The Frontiers of Criticism" is frequently invoked as the exemplar of Eliot's own celebrity status. Eliot's decision to take authorship out from behind the writing desk of the poet, critic, editor and banker, however, was, I want to suggest in the remaining part of this chapter, an attempt to control both the reception and the dissemination of his work, whilst protecting against copyright infringement. Put simply, a visible author becomes humanised, real and present to an audience, thus making more visceral the consequences for the author, as a living person, of intellectual property theft. As Ivan Kreilkampf has shown in the case of Charles Dickens, a lecture and reading series in the U.S. allowed him quite literally to perform authorship, the impetus for which was not only that it allowed him to transcend the passive-author figure, but also provided him with "a means of controlling, protecting, and in effect copyrighting his writing as speech."[670]

However, whilst Eliot had made his first major excursion onto the speaking platform as a lecturer at Cambridge, delivering the Clark Lectures at Trinity College in 1926, it was three years before he would advance to the radio in June 1929. Why this delay occurred has never really been satisfactorily explained, but I want to proffer here two possible explanations. The first orients around the imminent problems of copyright protection of broadcast works. Already by 1923, the BBC was in dispute

---

[668] Stephen B. Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 3

[669] Jonathan Goldman *Modernism is the Literature of Celebrity* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2011), 11

[670] See Ivan Kreilkamp, *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 90.

with the Society of Authors, Playwrights, and Composers over what the Society considered to be an infringement of author's rights by the unauthorized (and presumably unremunerated) use of their works on the radio. The resolution to this dispute, according to *The Times*, took place "in private" without legal recourse for the simple reason that no legal framework existed to protect the written work of authors from being broadcast without consent.[671] What this case highlights is the legal system's inability to keep pace with technological developments in audio-visual culture at that time. Only five years later, in 1928, would the Rome Conference for revisions to the Berne Convention outline in law the "exclusive right of authors to authorise the communication of their works to the public by means of radiodiffusion."[672] Even by 1929, when Eliot first ascended to the microphone, disputes regarding authorial control over what happened to the published manuscript were still ongoing, with a livid George Bernard Shaw writing to John Reith personally over the abridgment of *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*: "' If the producer has not already been shot, I will pay for the cartridges."'[673]

The second reason for Eliot's delay, and one that informs directly the subject of his talks, relates to the radio medium itself, and here it might be helpful again to return to the piratical methods of the Tudor publishers. For Pollard, in *Shakespeare's Fight With the Pirates*, there were three principle methods of piracy which allowed for the production of so-called bad quartos such as the *Hamlet* Q1: the first was stenographic reproductions of a performance by a spectator in the audience; the second was the obtaining of a prompt book from the "'hired men'" in the theatres, who "were poorly paid, and still more poorly esteemed[.]"; the third was by the Companies of Players themselves.[674] That these were exactly the challenges posed by the radio medium was a condition to which Eliot, clearly well read in the Elizabethan and Tudor playwrights, was evidently aware. Radio, however, had the added disadvantage of both an unseen author and an invisible and inaudible audience, thus

---

[671] "Broadcasting and Copyright: Authors' Royalty Demands" *The Times*, 10 April, 1923.
[672] Sam Ricketson *The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works: 1886-1986* (London: Centre for Commercial Law Studies, 1987), 103.
[673] Quoted in Robert G. Everding "Shaw and the Popular Context," in *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*, ed. Christopher Innes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 319.
[674] See Alfred W. Pollard *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text* (London: Alexander Moring Limited, 1917), 40-44.

making stenography considerably more inconspicuous than in an Elizabethan theatre. In all likelihood the possibility of a listener taking down Eliot's broadcast word-for-word was probably quite small, but it flags up what was an essentially irreconcilable issue with radio technology itself: what happens to the content and form of the broadcast once released into the ether?

Whilst Eliot could, to some degree, exercise authority over the written manuscript of a broadcast, how both his voice and the content of his programme were disseminated and manipulated by the listener post-broadcast was largely out of his control. Certainly it is not without significance that in his "Conclusion" to the series of lectures delivered at Harvard in 1933 he declares with startling candor, "I believe that the poet naturally prefers to write for as large and miscellaneous an audience as possible, and that it is the half-educated and ill-educated, rather than the uneducated, who stand in his way: *I myself should like an audience which could neither read nor write*" (emphasis added).[675] Eliot's assertion invokes Walter Ong's theory of primary orality, where the spoken word can exist independently of the text, is free, from the "residue or deposit" that burdens the written word and which forever makes it contingent on oral expression.[676] Having what might be considered a completely illiterate audience might significantly reduce the chances of piracy through transcription, but it also guarantees, paradoxically, the autonomy of the original broadcast: when the broadcast is repeated by word of mouth, it has the potential to adopt a new form or to be adapted in an act of creative collaboration not unlike the First and Second Quartos of *Hamlet*. Discursive power, therefore, returns to a state of equilibrium without compromising the integrity of, or materially perverting, the original text.

Whilst radio presented quite glaring problems of copyright protection to Eliot, he nevertheless used it as a metadiscursive means to synthesise these anxieties and to reaffirm the position of the author to be as culturally relevant a commodity as radio itself. The concluding section of this chapter, then, will address how the first of Eliot's broadcasts in particular demonstrates the method by which Modernism maintained an ongoing conversation with Renaissance constructions of literary property and authorship in a bid to understand its own relationship – which oscillated

---

[675] Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism,* 152.
[676] See Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Methuen, 1982), 8-12.

between adversarial, cooperative and contingent – to the synchronously developing copyright law of the early twentieth century.

4.3 "The Tudor Translators" (Broadcast June 12, 1929)

The first of Eliot's broadcasts for the BBC, "The Tudor Translators", seems an odd, if not slightly esoteric, starting point for a selection of talks on Tudor prose.[677] Perhaps anticipating some perplexity, Eliot opens the broadcast with an explanation as to his choice of genre. Reading Latin and Greek translations, he suggests, was akin to contemporary readers taking out a novel translated from "German or Scandinavian" from a library for the purpose of "enjoy[ing] (or not) the local colour and foreign scenes." Redolent of those commentaries discussed earlier regarding the declining numbers in readership and library membership, it is not surprising that the principle mandate of Elizabethan translation, even before accuracy, was to "make a book that would interest readers of books," the only method by which, Eliot argues in "Wilkie Collins and Dickens", to sustain or increase reading habits and the value of literature as a cultural and economic commodity.[678]

From his first broadcast, Eliot demarcates the frontier between creative, or literary, texts and literary criticism by assigning them both different platforms of dissemination. It was, of course, in the financial interests of the poet to promote the value of the written text, and whilst Eliot would periodically broadcast on the BBC throughout the thirties, these talks were strictly limited to the subject of literary criticism, religion, or European culture.[679] Not until May 1941 would Eliot recite any of his poetry over the airwaves, for which the choice of "East Coker" was significant not only because of its nationalistic power as a modern pastoral poem, but because the

---

[677] I refer here to the text of the broadcast as printed in the *The Listener* (12 June, 1929): 833-4.

[678] Eliot, "Wilkie Collins and Dickens", 525.

[679] One disastrous exception to the rule, however, was an "experimental" production of *The Waste Land*, broadcast on the 1 January, 1938. One letter in the BBC Written Archives to Eliot from an unknown correspondent expresses deep regret that "the script turned out in terms of production in a considerably different form from that which you expected," which suggests a profound, though predictable, dissatisfaction with the unauthorised manipulation of the finished text for broadcast. Given the censorship laws of the day, it is highly likely the sexual references and Lil's discussion of abortion made their way to the cutting room floor. See Letter from unknown correspondent to TSE, January 11, 1938, "R Conc 1. Eliot, T. S. Scriptwriter: 1935-68", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

broadcast itself spoke directly to the processes of production that filter through Eliot's first broadcast on "The Tudor Translators".

The broadcast of Eliot's "East Coker" coincided with a logistically complex period of copyright negotiation for the BBC. With the onset of the War the BBC had significantly expanded the quantity of its overseas broadcasts, and negotiations on copyright between the institution and the creator of a broadcast work were made complicated by the range of transmission: the airwaves could exceed the legal scope and parameters of the Berne Convention. Copyright was made further problematic by the new process of recording broadcasts, "a direct result of the war", which significantly altered the form of the broadcast – it was now a physical as opposed to ephemeral entity – and so altered the dynamics of ownership: "Even though these programmes are broadcast 'live'", explained the 1942 *Handbook*, "recordings are made at rehearsal so that, come what may, the broadcast should take place as scheduled". Recorded programmes (and "East Coker" was very likely recorded before it was broadcast on the Eastern Service) necessitated a complete re-working of existing contracts and understandings, for they facilitated the networking of international broadcasters, who could now send and receive material broadcasts.[680] Furthermore, Eliot's own relationship with the BBC on the subject of copyright was at times acrimonious, one internal memo from October 1938 expressing with considerable recalcitrance its frustration with Faber and Faber who, it thought, was demanding exorbitant fees. Reluctant to concede to Faber on their significant fees on the basis that it might set a precedent for other publishers, and so [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons], the author of the memo makes it clear that no poet should hold the institution to ransom, granting permission to the Programme department to authorise the [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]" if pushed: [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons]. Even Eliot, who was considered [This text has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons] was forced to negotiate and concede on BBC rates, adopting a more "reasonable" attitude towards the broadcasting of his poetry.[681]

---

[680] British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC Handbook 1942* (BBC: London, 1942), 113.

[681] D.F.D to A.C. , memo, "T.S. ELIOT.", October 7, 1938, "R Conc 1. Eliot, T. S. Scriptwriter: 1935-68", BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

"In my beginning is my end": taken from Part I of "East Coker", this is a line that is frequently taken to allude to Eliot's ancestral birth place, as well an anticipated final resting place (Eliot's ashes were scattered in East Coker). Completed in 1940, however, the "end" to which Eliot refers perhaps felt nearer than is generally appreciated given his duties as a fire warden in London in the early years of the War: the radio recitation of "East Coker" could quite plausibly have been the last broadcast he was to give. Fitting, then, that the poem should reference not only genealogical anxieties, but also the possible finality of his broadcasting career. Indeed, always lurking behind the text of "The Tudor Translators" is Eliot's East Coker ancestor Thomas Elyot, responsible, as Stuart Gillespie has demonstrated, for producing one of first direct translations of a text (Lucian's *Necromantia)* from Greek into English in 1530.[682] As such, his role as a Greek-English translator made him instrumental in what Eliot defines as the most valuable outcome of the efforts of the Tudor translators: "we can watch the English mind learning to think and to speak: we see many people learning to think in English where before only a few people had thought in Latin, and preparing a language in which anything could be expressed." According to Eliot, translation was central to the development of English as a language in that it pushed the limits of its vocabulary, prompted neologistic invention, reviving forgotten or neglected words and phrases, and, importantly, provided credence to vernacular idioms and turns of phrase. Although translation could "reveal the poverty of the vernacular", by providing syntactical and grammatical scaffolding, argued Eliot, it was responsible for instigating creativity in the English language, and, as a result, prompting intellectual development.[683] This was by no means a fresh peak in Eliot's ideological conception of the growth of the English language, having asserted as early on 1918 "that every writer who does not help to develop the language is to the extent to which he is read a positive agent of deterioration."[684] Indeed, it is this agency, this

---

[682] Stuart Gillespie, *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History*. (Oxford and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011): 6.
[683] Gillespie, 8. Steven Matthews has recently alerted Eliot scholars, albeit tentatively, to the memetic synergies present in the work of Eliot and his ancestor Thomas Elyot, especially in terms of the shifting of Early Modern linguistic paradigms of logic, oratory and rhetoric away from Latin towards English as a language finally capable of bearing the load of Renaissance Humanism's reconstitution of classical political and ethical discourses. See Steven Matthews, *T. S. Eliot and Early Modern Literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), 192.
[684] "Observations." *The Egoist* (May 1918): 69.

responsibility to create something new *within language*, which determined originality, and which was clearly born out of a copyright structure which prioritised *form* over *ideas*.

This creative impetus of translation laid the foundations for the proliferation of a uniquely English literature in a uniquely English idiom. Arguing in his broadcast that Shakespeare derived most of his knowledge from Thomas North's translations of Plutarch, he celebrates what he refers to elsewhere as the process of "fertilisation", by which Shakespeare transformed North's prose in to English verse.[685] Indeed, translation provided the blueprint for the process of creative stimulation that occurs when poets engage with the works of others – "appreciation is akin to creation" – whilst also establishing a framework for textual ownership.[686] Even the brazen "robbing" by Shakespeare of North's translation is forgivable because the integrity of North's text is protected by the transmutation of "fine prose into a piece of great poetry." The translators, in short, were responsible for instigating a continuous historical process by which each generation of author adapted and developed the English language, and it was to this end that Eliot would remain steadfastly committed throughout his lifetime and which underscored Modernism's love-affair with translation.[687] In addition, however, it is important to consider that Pound and Eliot, both of whom were responsible for establishing early on in the Modernist project a practice of "borrowing" or re-homing out-of-copyright texts, themselves were educated within a system that permitted, or licensed, copyright infringement. As Meredith McGill contends,

> by far the most frequently copyrighted texts in early America were practical works such as textbooks, manuals, atlases, and dictionaries – books that met a

---

[685] Eliot, "The Poets' Translation Series I-VI." *Poetry* 9, no.2 (November, 1916): 101-2.

[686] See Eliot's essay on "Ben Jonson" in *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism.* (London: Faber and Faber, 1997): 88.

[687] See, for example, Eliot's assertion in "The Social Function of Poetry" that "We may say that the duty of the poet, as poet, is only indirectly to his people: his direct duty is to his *language*, first to preserve, and second to extend and improve…[The genuine poet] discovers new variations of sensibility which can be appropriated by others. And in expressing them he is developing and enriching the language which he speaks." *On Poetry and Poets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957): 20.

republican standard of useful knowledge, had a broad appeal, and because of their usefulness, were thought to have enduring commercial value".[688]

Moreover, Marion Rust has recently shed light on the pervasive practice in early-Republic America of sanctioning the cutting and pasting of such printed educational works into new "original" pedagogical forms, despite the legislative measures of extending an author's copyright to twenty-eight years that had been codified in the 1831 Copyright Act. Indeed, as Rust frames it, authorial ownership, or the rights of "original genius," were not only destabilised but also deliberately undermined by the social and political agenda to encourage school children to "develop a sense of shared national character." [689] The formation of a community of knowledge scaffolded by the fusion of modern ("original") and reclaimed materials clearly echoes the militant nature of Pound's pedagogy, which, through the use of predominantly classical and supra-canonical tropes, sought to contest the "decrepit, corrupt, or simply too restrictive in Western education."[690] The agency involved in disassembling these original texts, whether nineteenth-century educational and pedagogical, or the classical and global texts of Modernism, demonstrates not only a century-long, trans-atlantic continuation of the tradition of permissible infringement, but reveals a nationalist element in the development of a cultural practice of bricolage that considered originality as having a composite form. Indeed, such a practice was a far cry from the ventriloquism of outright plagiarism, and both the copyright law of the post-Berne era and the Modernist translators were equally keen to stress the formal and linguistic peculiarities that separated the translated text from its original.

Certainly, translation in the early twentieth century was not, as Stuart Gillespie suggests, simply a case of "Translators speak[ing] in the person of their authors".[691] As Mark Rose points out, the possibility to view a translation as a completely new

---

[688] Meredith L. McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007): 49. Indeed, the protection of educational works, including atlases, maps, and dictionaries, became a central tenet of the U.S. 1831 Copyright Act, which was enacted largely as a result of the lobbying by Noah Webster, the lexicographer, for an extension of rights to encompass such works and to extend the period of copyright to twenty-eight years.
[689] Marion Rust, "'An Entire New Work'?: Abridgment and Plagiarism in Early U.S. Print Culture." *Studies in American Fiction* 38 (Spring and Fall, 2011): 146-7.
[690] Matthew Hofer, "Education" in *Ezra Pound in Context*, ed. Ira B. Nadel. (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 76.
[691] Gillespie, 10.

piece of work was proposed by the Lord Chancellor as early as 1720.[692] However, the concept of a translation as an autonomous piece of work existing independently of the original text became a legal paradigm following the first Berne Convention in 1886. Eliot's decision to prioritise translation in his broadcast series, one could argue, speaks directly not only to its cultural and linguistic value, but to its legal status: as Sam Ricketson notes, the integrity of the translation as a creative piece of work deserving of legal protection was the first right to be agreed upon in 1886. Moreover, the Convention also conferred upon the author of the original text the sole right to commission or authorise a translation.[693]

The site of translation, however, would become problematic when engaging with the works of living authors. Translation, in this case, is transformed into much more of a collaborative enterprise, if only by the physical proximity of the author and his power to authorise the translation, placing the translator in a much more precarious role of creative dependency and vulnerable to interference by the author. In 1929, Eliot was also engaged in the translation of Saint-John Perse's *Anabasis*, which had been published in France in 1924. Eliot's anxiety over the integrity of his claim to authorship of the translation, however, is palpable. In "The Tudor Translators" he reflects with some degree of envy on the privileged position of the first translators to create a new piece of work independent of external influence:

> Their very freedom, in introducing to an eager public literary treasures for the first time, makes possible at best a kind of fidelity denied to the modern translator. They give the effect, and I imagine had much of the feeling, of men writing the books themselves; we often have the impression of men thinking the thoughts, and feeling the emotions of the original authors.[694]

The freedom of Elizabethan translator to work in isolation from the author appears to provide him with unimpeded access to the "feeling" or mind of that author. Speaking in 1961 in "To Criticize the Critic", Eliot rails against the tendency of critics to neglect to consider how his "critical structure" evolved, changed and transformed over time and with maturity, rather than opening into a flat pack-like space in which

---

[692] Rose, 133.
[693] Ricketson, 384-5.
[694] Eliot, "The Tudor Translators", 205.

to spend "the rest of my life filling in the details".[695] Writing to Eliot in September 1929, Saint-John Perse worked hard to persuade Eliot of the "obligation to freedom" he conferred on Eliot to "take liberties with the necessities of rearrangement which any living translation inevitably demands".[696] Nevertheless, the six-year interim between publications of the original and translated texts provided sufficient time for the author to become dislocated from those thoughts and ideas that informed the poem at its conception. The figure of Saint-John Perse, therefore, hovers like a shadow, a burden from which the Elizabethan translators were completely free.

In his "Preface" to *Anabasis*, Eliot adopts a peculiar stance, which works both to acknowledge Saint-John Perse's presence in the translation whilst clearly erecting a ring fence around his claim to sole authorship:

> As for the translation, it would not be even so satisfactory as it is, if the author had not collaborated with me to such an extent as to be half-translator. What inaccuracies remain are due to my own willfulness, and not to my ignorance, which the author has corrected; and not to the author's ignorance, for he has, I can testify, a sensitive and intimate knowledge of the English language, as well as a mastery of his own.[697]

Couched in the language of self-deprecation, Eliot's creative independence becomes characterised as "willfulness" – the uncompromising determination to establish control over the final text. Although seemingly weakened by his own admission to the collaborative efforts of Perse, Eliot was in fact immune in practice to conceding sole authorship. In fact, the concept of collaboration, which critics such as Richard Badenhausen have advanced as central to Eliot's author-paradigm, was not recognised in copyright law. Within the 1911 Copyright Act, "'Author'" is nowhere defined. It is clear however that, where the idea of a work is suggested by one person and the work is executed by another, the latter is the author for purposes of copyright".[698] Indeed, where the author of the original text retains control over the "fertilisation" of its translation, the balance of power is redressed by the fact that providing the consent for translation does not equate to authorship. By situating themselves within a

---

[695] Eliot, *To Criticize the Critic and Other Writings* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965):14.
[696] *Letters IV*, 601n.
[697] "Preface" in Saint-John Perse, *Anabasis*, trans. T. S. Eliot (London: Faber and Faber, 1930), 11.
[698] Putnam, 415.

collaborative process, the Modernists could actually foreground their presence much more effectively with the careful dismantling of these collective structures of authorship. Aaron Jaffe astutely points to the tendency of Modernist authors in memoirs and autobiographical sketches to inflate the role collaboration played in the construction of their works. Jaffe argues that the anecdotal evidence supplied by such authors as testimony to the collaborative impulse frequently collapses in on itself to reveal the "would-be literary collaborator in what is at best an apocryphal role."[699] For all its pretensions to collaborative authorship, the Modernist project was still very much indebted to those early copyright laws, which not only sought to strengthen authorial integrity, but which also paved the way for the professionalisation of authorship by providing a legitimate market economy that could compensate individual writers and secure their position as the undisputable authors to works often indebted to those writers and playwrights of the past. For, as one Jack Daniels wisely observes, "No one ever built a monument to a committee."

4.4 "The Elizabethan Grub Street" (Broadcast 18 June, 1929)

If Eliot's first broadcast hinted at the embryonic authorship status of the Tudor translators, who at once relied upon and asserted their independence from their source-language text, "The Elizabethan Grub Street" would reference the birth of a primitive, though crucial, concept of authorship and ownership more familiar to his (and our) day. This was, Eliot determines, by no means a twilight sleep: whilst Ben Jonson was notoriously setting forth a precedent for authorial proprietorship, Elizabeth Grub Street authors, by contrast, were frequently utilizing their anonymity to economic and political effect. Grub Street authors, he explains, were frequently hired to write "controversial pamplets" many of which were "highly vituperative".[700] Yet whilst this form of freelance work provided them with a means by which to live by the pen, the Grub Street writers were still very much yoked to a patron-consumer, whose investment was still at this point active and collaborative.

This point assumes greater significance when considering Eliot's own enforced collaboration with the BBC with regards to the editing of his broadcasts, and with the *Listener* magazine, which not only edited the manuscript, but which

---

[699] Aaron Jaffe, *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 97.
[700] Eliot, "The Elizabethan Grub Street", 853.

temporarily relieved the author from ownership of the text. Indeed, this radio broadcast, in particular, provides a canopy for early twentieth-century discussions on the author paradigm and the tendency of many Modernist writers to at once rely on and evade the concrete parameters of authorship as set out by the Berne Convention, as well as for reflection on the collaborative aesthetic of Modernism (problematised though it was by its ostracism from the legal framework of authorship). Importantly, however, this broadcast, by figuring Daniel Defoe, that "greater genius", as the first prototype of a modern author, allows Eliot to foreground the forces of authorial rights and responsibilities. I will attend, first of all, to Eliot's reflections, in this broadcast, on collaboration, not, as in the previous lecture, as a genre that purchased for the author a proprietorial strength through cooperation, but rather as a means by which authorship can be submerged beneath the polyphony of the collaborative conversation.

By the time Eliot took to the microphone in 1929, collaboration had adopted an entirely new and more tangible form for him. Although never entirely divorced from collaboration as an aesthetic concept – or, indeed, from one that could fertilize the writing process – Eliot's collaborative impulse was to become more pragmatic. As Ronald Schuchard reveals, from late 1925, when he was taken on as an editor at Faber and Faber, Eliot's job description involved "advis[ing] the firm on poetry, drama, detective fiction, economics, religious and philosophical books and works in French and German".[701] This role, however, was supplemented by the obligatory participation in the Book Committee's weekly meetings, at which, around an octagonal table, his own reports and evaluations of authors would be discussed and assessed by the other committee members. Indeed, his work at Faber demanded a much more cooperative working method of selection to shape the firm's own literary canon. As Frank Morley recalls, Eliot retained a "' self-controlled'" composure at these meetings: '"It was difficult to bully him; he had the courage to say No. But he could also say Yes"'.[702]

Nevertheless, collaboration as both a cultural aesthetic and moral imperative would be the source of some unease for Eliot for most of his life. As late as 1953, Eliot was commenting upon the burden of participating in committee life, which he reconstitutes into an at once legal and natural obligation initiated by his grandfather:

---

[701] Schuchard, 68.
[702] Quoted in Schuchard, 68.

> Not the least of these laws [passed down from his grandfather, William Greenleaf Eliot], which included injunctions still more than prohibitions, was the Law of Public Service: it is no doubt owing to the impress of this law upon my infant mind that, like other members of my family, I have felt, ever since I passed beyond my early irresponsible years, an uncomfortable and very inconvenient obligation to serve upon committees.[703]

This, however, was not the first time that Eliot had expressed anxiety over the pervasiveness of the committee in what he considered to be his public life. In "Difficulties of a Statesman", published in 1932, the heavily spondaic line of "Cry what shall I cry?" which opens the poem, foregrounds how the individual voice becomes subsumed by the dominancy of the collective voice. Indeed, the litany of orders that Eliot goes on to list – from the British orders of "The Companions of the Bath, the Knights of the British Empire, the // Cavaliers" to the French ("Legion of Honour"), Prussian ("Order of the Black Eagle") and Japanese ("Order of the Rising Sun") equivalents – span an historical period from medievalism to the orders of the early twentieth century, but all have a foundation in the Chivalric tradition.[704] Chivalric orders, as Alan Davis asserts, whilst originally intended to acknowledge acts of bravery and self-sacrifice to the Monarch in the Middle Ages, was, by the Renaissance, "viewed as an ideology distinctively concerned with justifying rank and precedence through assertions of pedigree and lineage".[705] Hereditary notions of public obligation are clearly prioritized here, but they also point to a more dangerous precedent. The chivalric tradition, like the committee, is predicated on the act of self-sacrifice and self-effacement for the benefit of the greater good – in this case committees for the "Water Supply" and the "Public Works". Individualism necessarily collapses under this burden, and the individuated cries of each member are eventually subsumed by the collective and purportedly unifed committee voice.

In the years following World War I however, the hereditary value of these prestigious orders had decreased, largely as a result of the frequency with which they were conferred right across the class system. What emerged in its wake was a leviathan structure of commissions, which became sites of social exclusion, being the

---

[703] Eliot, "American Literature and the American Language", 2.
[704] *CPP*, 129-130.
[705] Alan Davis, *Chivalry and Romance in the English Renaissance*. (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003): 3

territory of the upper middle classes. Eliot's instances this in the figure of the lone telephone operator, who serves "The consultative councils, the standing committees, select committees // and sub-committees". As the only person in the entire poem to be granted the privilege of an autonomous voice by virtue of his profession, Arthur Edward Cyril Parker's own individuality is lost in the compound of his own names, which allude to the social aspirations of the working-class, whilst his voice remains forever muted by the Babylonic noise of the middle class committee. Indeed, Parker's voice quickly becomes submerged by the polyphonous voices of the committee and their proliferative capacity for clonal reproduction: "A committee has been appointed to nominate a commission of// engineers // To consider the Water Supply". Crucial here is the complete and violent submergence of Parker, both in voice and body (he never reappears in the poem), beneath the "joint committee" of "fletchers and javelin-makers and smiths". Even for so benign a cause as the Beethoven Centennial, Eliot was extremely cautious as to how his name should be used for the "committee of persons", the caveat, even for this occasion, being that "I was not expected to subscribe without my previous sanction to any action purporting to be made by the said committee".[706] Allowing others to capitalize on the "value" of his name, however, did not equate to an unchecked transference of self and voice to a majority rule, as might be expected of a committee member. Hovering always on the periphery of the committee, Eliot retained tight control over the content of what his voice could be seen to author and securing the autonomous status of his voice even in what purported to be a collective forum.

Although this might seem a rather indulgent digression from Eliot's broadcast on "The Elizabethan Grub Street", it is, I think, necessary in order to foreground the degree to which authorial voice and identity as intrinsic components of twentieth-century notions of authorship were having to be reconfigured in an increasingly polyphonous public landscape. As Thomas Streeter notes, towards the end of the nineteenth century "[t]he conflict between the liberal ideal of the entrepreneurial individual and the impersonal, collective nature of corporations was obvious, and generated considerable debate".[707] The committee of "stockholders, managers, and

---

[706] TSE to Frederick N. Sand, January 15, 1927, *Letters III,* 374.
[707] Thomas Streeter "Broadcast Copyright and the Bureaucratization of Property" in Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi, eds., *The Construction of Authorship: Textual*

boards of trustees" predominated to such an extent that in public life the individual mono-voice was being subordinated by the group uni-voice. These debates, of course, arose at a time when codified and prescriptive ideas of intellectual property were having a direct effect on the ownership of a commercial, and that these debates should spill over in publishing and contaminate discourses on authorship and literary property was an unavoidable side-effect. Whilst Eliot was frequently called upon to sit on numerous boards and committees precisely because of the audible range – both in the ether and on the page – of his voice, the unavoidable consequence was the paradoxical sacrifice of that voice to accommodate, and at times even channel, a group identity and politic.

Yet was author anonymity an act of self-sacrifice, or was it a subversive and dangerous device used by authors to minimize the collateral damage to themselves caused by putting transgressive views into print? Or was "Anon", as Virginia Woolf boldly asserted in her posthumously published essay of the same name, in fact "dead" – having taken his final breath after Francis Bacon, who taught the poet "to express more" and thus sacrificed his facelessness. Scholarship on the question has largely adopted a partisan stance on this subject, favouring either one approach or the other. Where David Vincent asserts that "[p]rofessing individual identity was a sign of a mature liberal democracy", quite distinct from those more subversive writers often associated with criminal or dubious movements, who hid behind anonymity or the pseudonym, Rachel Sagna Buurma, on the other hand, has argued for the self-sacrificing, self-effacing capacity of the author who chooses the pseudonym or anonymity. Many Victorian readers, she suggests, "view[ed] the author as having given up name and even personality for a greater good or an increased collective authority, rather than for the production of a deferred individual celebrity."[708] In both cases, however, anonymity is predicated on agency and power, or the conscious decision to submerge one's identity. However, the pseudonym, the descendant of Anon, takes on a unique and perhaps more powerful function altogether. Indeed, a pseudonym, one could argue, is a narrative in itself, a construct that allows the author

---

Appropriation in Law and Literature. (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994): 308

[708] See David Vincent *The Culture of Secrecy: Britain, 1832-1998.* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998): 67; Rachel Sagna Buurma, "Anonymity, Corporate Authority, and the Archive: The Production of Authorship in Late-Victorian England" *Victorian Studies* 50 (Autumn 2007):17

to bind the audience, who in turn bind the text, to an idea of authorship and personality. If we accept this argument, the pseudonym takes on a paratextual form, performing an integral part in influencing the reception and interpretation of the text as well as an audience's relationship to the work, rather than being merely ancillary to its production and dissemination.

The point at which Eliot's Elizabethan Grub Street hacks intervene is in this transition between the death of Anon and the birth of Defoe, whose landmark "Essay on the Regulation of the Press", published in 1704, marked the transformation of the author from persona to personality. Between these two important events, anonymity, the pseudonym, the heteronym, and the orthonym existed in a vexed and fluctuating state, their interactions, for Eliot, not only leading to a definitive (and eventually legalized) concept of authorship, but one which provided a *creative* site for experiment with, and development of, the English language and its literature. Far from Woolf's assertion that the "Elizabethans are silent", devoid of "intimate" or "colloquial language" and dogged by the "rhythm of the Bible…in their ears", Eliot valorized the "hack novelists and pamphleteers" who not only predated Defoe and his "developed language", but were far from divorced from the rhythms of Elizabethan speech. [709] The social contradictions inherent in such playwrights as "Greene, Dekker, Nashe, Deloney, and Lodge", whose education took them as far as Oxford or Cambridge, but whose occasional "disreputable" antics dropped them as low as the Grub Street, made fertile creative ground of the coupling of "great poverty" and "hand to mouth" existence with their elite educational backgrounds. Their "reckless[s]" existence and poverty, moreover, put them in touch with that "colloquial language" of the Grub Street, which collided with the eloquent pen of Oxbridge to create some of the most original and beautiful works of the Tudor period, accessible even to the uneducated audience.

Ostracized, as Eliot claims, by their fellow university peers, these hacks were thrust into the unique position whereby they could migrate across social and professional tiers. This sociable and professional fluidity, however, extended to their understanding and manipulation of the concept of authorship. Frequently commissioned to write controversial political and theological pamphlets or exposés of the "underworld," hack writers were responding to what was essentially the first mass

[709] Woolf, "'Anon' and 'The Reader': Virginia Woolf's Last Essays," ed. Brenda Silver, *Twentieth-Century Literature* 25, no. 3/4 (Fall-Winter): 388.

consumer readership, the symptoms of which resonated with early twentieth-century challenges in the relationship between the press and an uncritical reading public. As Judith H. Anderson remarks, during the Tudor period, "the perceived relation of the mind and especially of the imagination to the material and factual world was changing, and with it, the conception of truth and its relation to fiction".[710] This indiscriminate "mixing [of] fact and fiction", Eliot asserts, had clear parallels with the twentieth-century press, who pandered to the readers' desires for "confessions of criminals, accounts of famous crimes, etc.," a point to which he would return in a *Criterion* "Commentary" just a year later where he castigates the press for their role in depleting the public's capacity for critical reflection.[711] Twentieth-century newspapers might have been returning the readership to a regressive state of primary orality to the extent that the modern reader was "less capable of voting with any discrimination at the smallest municipal election, than if he could neither read nor write," but this fusion of fact and fiction for the hack writers was, in contrast, progressive and generative in nature: "They mingled a certain amount of truth with what may be called realistic fiction, and in this prepared the way for their greater exemplar Defoe."

There were, however, genuine contextual reasons as to why Eliot saw fit to position Tudor and Modern conflations of fact and fiction side by side. In January 1927, The Committee of Management of the Society of Authors entered into negotiations with the insurance firm Lloyds (Eliot's former employer) to provide cover for authors in the event of "vexatious legal actions based on alleged libel or infringement of copyright".[712] Such a policy points not only to an increase of litigious activity in the post-Berne era, but also to the fact that the responsibilities of authorship were becoming heavily enforced. Yet perhaps the most astounding factor in the development of such an insurance policy was its provision for indemnity against

---

[710] Judith H. Anderson. *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing*. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984), 1.

[711] "What the reader allows his paper to do for him is to select what is important and to suppress what is unimportant, to divert his mind with shallow discussions of serious topics, to destroy his wits with murders and weddings and curates' confessions, and to reduce him to a condition in which he is less capable of voting with any discrimination at the smallest municipal election, than if he could neither read nor write. To amuse people is to have power over them; and power is power, even if its possessors have not the slightest notion what they are doing with it." "A Commentary" in *The Criterion* 9, no. 35 (January 1930): 184.

[712] "Authors and Libel Actions" *The Times*, January 5, 1927.

"legal proceedings which may be taken against him in which it is alleged that in any of his works which are published or performed he has, by the use of a name or names, or by the description of any character, scene, or incident, or by any comment thereon, or otherwise defamed person or persons".[713] This was not, however, a means by which authors could safeguard themselves against deliberate libel on their part. Rather, astonishingly, it was designed to protect them from those apparently numerous readers unable to distinguish between factual and fictional representations of reality, including those who brought libel lawsuits on the basis, for example, that the plaintiff and the villain shared the same name, or against the depiction of a fictional estate involved in some disreputable plot that by coincidence shared the same name as a real manor. That such extreme legal action was absent from the Tudor publishing landscape points not only to the firm presence of copyright and libel law in the public imagination in the early twentieth century, but that, unlike their Tudor counterparts, modern audiences were more experientially aware of the tangible presence of the embodied author.

By contrast, the manner in which the hack writers could "preten[d] to be reformed thieves, sometimes to be merely public-spirited citizens" spoke to the way that Eliot viewed authorship as a fluid, unformed, and arbitrary concept in the Tudor period. It is in the adoption of authorial personas, such as the thief or the subversive theological or political protestor, that the practice of paratextualism really comes into play, and where the construction of a fictitious authorial identity can be acknowledged as an integral component of the completed textual product. Such practice might invoke Foucault's, as well as Eliot's, notion of the evaporating author, who, like making patterns in quicksand with his feet, is subsumed under the weight of the text itself: "Using all the contrivances that he sets up between himself and what he writes, the writing subject cancels out the signs of his particular individuality. As a result, the mark of the writer is reduced to nothing more than the singularity of his absence; he must assume the role of the dead man in the game of writing".[714] What this particular variant of the death of the author suggests, however, is a degree of agency, of willingness, on the part of the author to self-sacrifice.

We might question, however, whether anonymity actually reverses this process, brings the author, so to speak, back from the dead. For one might argue that a

[713] "Insurance Against Libel Actions" *The Times*, January 28, 1927.
[714] Foucault, "What is an Author?", 206

greater degree of agency, of self-consciousness, is involved in the decision to efface one's personality or one's presence from the text, that the energy expended in doing so actually foregrounds the author's presence. Indeed, for Virginia Woolf, the original author "Anon," whose vitality stems from his oral method of dissemination, is situated outside of society: subversive and feared, with the ability to mock, Anon lingers around the back door of respectability: "during the silent centuries before the book was printed his was the only voice to be heard in England. […] It was the printing press that finally was to kill Anon. But it was the press also that preserved him. […] The first blow has been aimed at Anon when the authors [sic] name is attached to the book".[715] Like Eliot, Woolf identifies the birth of the author as a discrete individual – quite separate from the narrative woven around Anon – personified in Defoe.

Defoe's *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press* underpins Eliot's conception of authorship. Defoe, like Eliot, understood that copyright was the site at which there is a natural confluence of rights and responsibility. Unlike Milton's *Areopagitica*, which had posited that manuscripts be marked by the name of the author almost as a courtesy, Defoe was adamant that only orthonymic truth could guarantee the authenticity of the text: "If the Name of the Author, or of the Printer, or of the Bookseller, for whom it is printed, be affix'd, every Man is safe that sells a Book; but if not, then no Man will sell it, but he that hath some private Reason for propagating what the Book treats of, and such a Man has some Title to pass for the Author".[716] Enormous power seems to circulate around the printed name, entering the author into an obligatory contract with his reader that confirms both his presence and his personality – or personal investment – in the text, whilst bringing the author, as a citizen, within the boundaries of the law.

For Defoe, however, clear legal parameters needed to be set which could alert the author to the specific punishment of libel or sedition: "if a Man robs a House, counterfeits the Coin, or kills a Man, he knows what he has to trust to, but Authors have never known their Punishment". The absence of uniformity in the punishment for such crimes meant that legal judgment was dangerously subjective and open to

---

[715] Woolf, 383-5
[716] Daniel Defoe, *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press* (Oxford: Luttrell Society; Basil Blackwell, 1948), 17.

abuse. Over three hundred years later, however, Eliot was to show that, even with modern censorship and copyright laws, the vagaries of the law with regards to "vice" were still very much present. Speaking in 1935, he remarks that, "Under the present state of affairs it is rather safer to publish a book which deals pleasantly with vice than a book which makes it repulsive. In publishing a book which may be highly moral, but which offends the prejudices of a magistrate no one can be sure what the penalty may be". Nevertheless, in the same speech, Eliot confirms the need for censorship to counter "pornographic literature": "Whatever one thinks of periodicals in little shops or some novels in big shops, if there were no risks in publishing things would probably be a great deal worse".[717] The danger of pornography ("the periodicals in little shops"), as opposed to pornographic literature, was the absence of authorship. Frequently anonymous, pornography was subversive not merely because of its pernicious content, but because, without the claim to authorship – in fact, very often, in its total rejection of authorship – it operated in the hinterland of the law.

But what of the fate of anonymity after Defoe? In a letter to St John Perse in January 1927 regarding his translation of Perse's *Anabase* (discussed earlier), Eliot displays remarkable sensitivity to the instability of the pseudonym: "may I say in my preface that St J. Perse and St Léger Léger, the author of *Anabase* and the author of *Éloges* are identical, or do you wish me to preserve your fragile anonymity?".[718] As a diplomat, Perse's identity as an author was necessarily precarious. Yet, although Eliot might be aggrandizing Perse's status as an author here, the reference to "fragile anonymity" may well reference a much larger, and personal, preoccupation with anonymity in an age where libel laws were frequently being invoked and where authorial identity, by virtue of copyright law, had become increasingly rigid. Curious too, in this postscript is Eliot's conflation of the pseudonym and anonymity. Although anonymity in writing was still very much present in the years preceding the 1886 Berne Convention, as David Vincent has shown, the public reaction and reception to this form of authorial self-effacement had conferred upon it a stigma: "Only despots and those subject to them had the need to deny who they were".[719] Virginia Woolf's

---

[717] "Book Censorship: Mr. T. S. Eliot on the Need for Some Control" *The Manchester Guardian*, July 10, 1935.
[718] *Letters III*, 374n .
[719] Vincent, 67

own consciously retrospective account of "Anon" suggests, too, that anonymity had succumbed to print's unforgiving condemnation: "Anon had great privileges. He was not responsible. He was not self conscious. He is not self conscious. He can borrow. He can repeat. He can say what every one feels. No one tries to stamp his own name, to discover his own experience, in his work. He keeps at a distance from the present moment."[720] The hesitancy betrayed by the present tense here, however, suggests that anonymity had persevered, and indeed it was a mechanism by which Eliot would frequently write his own reviews, remarking in 1928 to Bonamy Dobrée that, had he put his name to a review of Lytton Strachey's *Elizabeth and Essex*, "I should probably have been more severe."[721] Rather than being able "to say what everyone feels", however, for Eliot, anonymity appears to impede honesty, especially when an attack would appear cowardly coming from a faceless reviewer.

Nevertheless, the Modernist proclivity for the pseudonym, I want to finish by arguing, was a method by which they could subvert, challenge and unsettle the rather unyielding boundaries of authorship as set out in early twentieth-century copyright law, even as it sought to reinforce those rights that accompanied it. Eliot, was by no means alone in his use of pseudonyms: Cicely Isabel Fairfield wrote under name of Rebecca West, Hilda Aldington (Doolittle) under the initials H.D., and Edna St. Vincent Millay as Nancy Boy. Indeed, there is a sense when surveying Modernist pseudonyms that, rather predictably, women more frequently resorted to the use of a male pen name. The extent to which Modernism's patriarchal figures as Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot were actually exploring and subverting the pseudonym as a traditionally effeminized practice deserves some attention, but finally I want to conclude by suggesting that it was through the pseudonym that Eliot challenged authorship as a stable concept in spite of the rigid legislation that encompassed it.

Eliot's pseudonyms and heteronyms, from the very literal "Metoikos", meaning resident alien, to J. Alfred Prufrock, persistently figure the author as outsider, imbuing this authorial shell with a status that is at best non-committal. There is a sense, however, in both names of being trapped between a state of permanency and impermanency, whether granted permanent leave to reside on the outskirts of citizenship, or destined, like Prufrock, to negotiate an unending and gyroscopic

---

[720] Woolf, 397
[721] TSE to Bonamy Dobrée, December 11, 1928, *Letters IV,* 356.

network of dismal streets. Indeed, one of Eliot's earlier pseudonyms, T. S. Apteryx, was frequently employed for reviews in *The Egoist*, and whilst perhaps providing that screen for his more splenetic outbursts (a tactic, as his dealings with the Strachey biography demonstrate, that he would later reject), it hints at a fractured concept of authorship. In retaining the "T. S." of his initials, themselves stripped-down to the bare minimum of the orthonym, Eliot combines the genuine with the fictive. "Apteryx", a flightless bird, is bound by a leash to those more stable and intractable residues of authorship and identity, but such a pseudonym, I think, points also to an unwilling, if inescapable, sacrifice of the self, as Foucault claims, to a legitimized and literally inscribed authorship.

That Eliot, however, considered this to be an unsustainable requirement of the author paradigm is probably best exemplified in his pseudonym "Gus Krutzsch", used to undersign his 1921 poem "Song to the Opherian." Although critics such as Michael North have drawn parallels between this pseudonym and Joseph Conrad's "Kurtz" from *Heart of Darkness,* Krutzsch also has an etymology that works self-reflexively to suggest the decay of "traditional" notions of authorship. Whilst "Krutzsch" might invoke *Kreus*, or "cross", in German, it also has a lineage in the German verb *krutschen*, which means to be sickly, or alternatively to groan and creak under a burden. Given, as discussed in Chapter One, Eliot's liminal status in relation to citizenship which was preoccupying him at this time, it is unsurprising that he should invoke a pseudonym that performs its own fragility, that directs our attention to a pathological crisis in authorship. Here, I will conclude by suggesting instead that by 1921, the process of the fracturing and dissolution of authorship had come about not only as it buckled underneath the weight of the rigid and prescriptive structures of the Berne Convention, but in Modernism's constant grapple to reconcile the perceived unjust, archaic, and glacial strictures of censorship and with the outdated Romantic notions of authorship and literary property inherited by the Berne Convention. As new technologies demanded authors reconsider the parameters of the profession, whether authorship should be a process of artificial construction or of self-effacement would be a continuing debate within Modernism. Perhaps Eliot puts the case best when, in an assessment of Lord Herbert of Cherbury's autobiography, from his final broadcast in 1929 of "The Tudor Biographers" (broadcast 16 July, 1929), he concludes with the following assertion:

> What information Herbert gives us [in his autobiography] about himself is not quite what he intended to convey; but although he is not, we feel, really frank about himself, yet he professed and pretended to be, and that is already something.[722]

[722] Eliot, "The Tudor Biographers." *The Listener* 2, no.27 (July 17, 1929): 95.

Conclusion

This thesis has sought to examine how Eliot undertook a revisionist approach to the construction of authorship in a post-World War I context. Indeed, the environment out which Eliot began to reassess the boundaries the authorship bore witness to technological changes that prioritized voice in the cultural economy. The growth of radio clearly indicated to Eliot that in order to effect cultural and social change, and to promote the growth of the cultural health of the nation through linguistic renewal and fertilization, required the cultivation of a speaking voice imbued with the authority traditionally inherent in print. Yet whilst these arguments have been rehearsed previously to some extent through the work of Todd Avery and Michael Coyle, scholarship, until this point, has not attended to the political and social influences that shaped the most lucrative and successful components of Eliot's authorship construct.

Chapter One goes some way to redressing this void in the history of Eliot's transition into the public intellectual role by adopting a long-distance view of the intellectual and political development of Eliot's public intellectual voice. Here I have argued that Eliot's encounters with both the demise of British Liberalism and the rise of American "Wilsonian" Liberalism during the final years of World War I provoked two simultaneous and inevitably interlinked concerns for Eliot. The first was the institution of tariff reform by Wilson in 1913, which declared the principle of free trade. This had a profound effect on the family finances at a time when Eliot's circumstances were already straightened. However, as this Chapter has shown, Eliot's reaction to this law in his letters to his family was equivocatory, for it emerged during a period in which the period of intellectual free trade was being corroded through Wartime embargos, and, as Chapter Four demonstrates, the tightening of copyright and censorship laws in the U.S. Eliot, then, encountered an intellectual paradox that required careful negotiation.

What this inevitably threw up, moreover, was Eliot's ambivalent relationship with national identity. As intellectual free trade was curtailed, circumstances for expatriate Americans were likewise becoming increasingly problematic, with prohibitions in place on freedom of movement. Moreover, in the context of post-War Europe in which national boundaries and the institutions of cultural identity had been plundered, Eliot's *The Waste Land* demonstrates the uncomfortable mutability of

national identity: Eliot, like millions of Europeans, were having to reassess a once-stable cultural sense identity in an environment in which political lines of identity were being redrawn. Moreover, for Eliot, the financial burden of federal income tax, a taxation premised on the obligations of American citizenship without the endowments of *rights* of citizenship, prompted the decision to apply for British citizenship.

By attending to the process of citizenship, this chapter evaluated how Eliot concurrently began to reassess the parameters of traditional authorship as he assumed the editorship of the *Criterion*. Despite the tendency in Eliot scholarship to identify an epiphanic moment in 1927 when Eliot converted to Anglo-Catholicism and attained his British citizenship, this chapter addressed the six-year process towards naturalization that began in 1921. Indeed, the intellectual transitions Eliot made during this period and the publication of *The Hollow Men*, reveal Eliot's conviction that national identity itself was a nebulous and protean construct. As he took to the microphone in 1929, however, cultural identity had been reconstituted into an institutional framework, which permitted and licensed his engagement with such British institutions of cultural identity as the BBC and the British Council.

Chapter Two continued this line of enquiry by examining how Eliot's 1942 lectures for the British Council in Sweden not only indicated a long-standing commitment to the Liberal principle of free intellectual exchange, but provided the groundwork for *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, published six years later. Indeed, where Eliot witnessed a repeat of the intellectual devastation wrought by trade embargos first implemented during World War I, Eliot's position in relation to British cultural institutions ensured that it was through voice that such borders could be transgressed. Moreover, his early engagement with the British Council bore witness to the way in which Eliot appropriated an anthropological approach to international public intellectualism. As a naturalized citizen, Eliot profited from the peripheral position he occupied at the edges of national identity, from where he could observe the impact of shifting political tectonics on the cultural health of nations. By attending to the political developments in Europe at the time, moreover, this chapter sought to demonstrate that Eliot's criticism on the social function of poetry and on the need for the return of dramatic prosody to the everyday was often deliberately written and delivered in response to the rise of nationalist rhetoric in the years during and immediately after World War II. In building on Meredith Martin's contention that systems of prosody were historically contingent, this chapter offers a narrative and

historicity to the system of prosody Eliot advocated throughout the 1940s. In particular, I argue that Eliot's call for a return to the local in dramatic prosody, was a mechanism by which to encourage national and European unity through localism.

In Chapter Three, this narrative returns to the period between 1928 and 1933, during which time Eliot engaged more fully with recording technologies. Having been involved in the production of James Joyce's record of *Anna Livia Plurabelle*, Eliot began reflect both on the commercial and aesthetic advantages of the phonographic recording. Moreover, although Chapter Two dealt more intensively with Eliot's theory on the prosody of the local or everyday, this chapter sought to provide an historical legacy for the development of such a theory in prosody and dialect. Indeed, Eliot's recordings at Harvard and Columbia coincided with an organized, scholarly attempt to preserve and map the American dialects, and I argue in this chapter that both Eliot and the linguist William Cabell Greet at Columbia were influenced by the anthropological phonographic practices of Franz Boas. Eliot's decision to record at educational institutions in America, moreover, would not only characterize the scholastic framework around which his recordings were to be heard, but offered Eliot a mechanism by which to voice poetry for the record without the threat of intellectual property theft during a period when he resisted the performance of his poetry on the radio.

Chapter 4 addressed in more detail Eliot's complex negotiations with authorship and copyright. Although Chapters One and Two sought to identify the origins of Eliot's longstanding belief in the principle of intellectual free trade, it was a principle that had a complex and problematic relationship with the institutions of copyright and radio. Yet this chapter also seeks to redress the absence of Eliot in the most recent scholarly accounts of Modernism's often-fraught engagement with copyright. As Eliot began to clarify his position in relation to free intellectual exchange in the finals years of World War I, this principle was encountering political resistance through the enforcement of censorship laws in the U.S., which not only impacted on creative free expression, but, as Eliot was to discover with the publication of "Mr. Apollinax", also influenced the way in which editors manipulated the final copy of an author's work.

Yet what accounts for Eliot's omission from scholarship into Modernism and copyright is a reluctance to participate in the inflammatory rhetoric against copyright exhibited by Pound, Lawrence and Margaret Anderson. Instead, it was through the

editorship of the *Criterion* that Eliot most fully engaged not with the rhetoric against copyright but with the scholarly understanding of its historical development and the emergence of modern authorship. It was through the emergence of New Bibliography studies and the publication of articles addressing the historical challenges of copyright that paved the way for Eliot's own lectures on the subject in 1929.

Having already begun to reflect on the function of the public intellectual, the ascension to the microphone would appear to have been a logical step for Eliot. Yet copyright law had not caught up with developments in radio technology, and Eliot encountered a creative medium that left the author unprotected from copyright infringement. Yet Eliot's construction of the public intellectual figure was premised on the principle of a free exchange of ideas, one which found consonance in the technology of radio, yet a principle that seemed at odds with the concept of intellectual copyright. In his radio broadcasts on "Six Types of Tudor Prose", however, Eliot appears to seek objective distance from these immediate debates, mediating this anxiety instead through discussions of authorship in the Renaissance. It was through an exegesis on Defoe, however, that Eliot articulated to his audience longstanding governing principles of authorship: that rights are accompanied by responsibilities.

This thesis has been directed by the narratives exhumed from Eliot's literary archives, a process of research which has, I hope, informed the structure of this thesis. Because of the longevity of Eliot's career and the sheer volume of his output, there has been a tendency to isolate periods in Eliot's intellectual development, whilst critical "companions" have compounded the issue of a disjointed narrative. By reassessing Eliot's construction of the author paradigm through the voice, I hope that this thesis has gone some way in demonstrating the need for Eliot scholarship to be bolder in taking a longitudinal view of his professional development.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham.

"T. S. Eliot Collection of Papers, 1918-1989", Berg Collection, New York Public Library.

Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

"Farrar, Straus & Giroux, Inc. Records", The New York Public Library Manuscripts and Archives Division.

Hayward Bequest, Kings College, Cambridge.

"T. S. Eliot Papers", Houghton Library, Harvard University

"House of Books Collection", Columbia Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, New York.

"I. A. Richard Papers", Magdalene College, Cambridge.

The National Archives, Kew.

Primary Sources

Abravanel, Genevieve. *Americanizing Britain: The Rise of Modernism in the Age of the Entertainment Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Ackroyd, Peter. *T. S. Eliot.* London: Hamish Hamilton, 1984.

Adams, Amanda. *Performing Authorship in the Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic Lecture Tour*. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2014.

Adorno, Theodor W. "The Form of the Phonograph Record." Translated by Thomas Y. Levin. *October* 55 (Winter, 1990): 56-61.

Ames, Eric. "The Sound of Evolution." *Modernism/modernity* 10 (April, 2003): 297 325.

Anderson, Judith H. *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984.

Anderson, Margaret. "Judicial Opinion (Our Suppressed October Issues)." *The Little Review* 4, no. 8 (December, 1917): 46-48.

Appelbaum, David. *Voice*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Armstrong, Tim. *Modernism, Technology, and The Body*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.

Avery, Todd. *Radio Modernism: Literature, Ethics, and the BBC, 1922-1938*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006.

Bernstein, Charles. "Introduction" In *Close Listening: Poetry and the Performed Word*. Edited by Charles Bernstein, 3-26. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC Handbook 1942*. BBC: London, 1942.

Bornstein, George. "Introduction." In *Representing Modernism Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, edited by George Bornstein, 1-16. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1991.

The British Council. "Production Notes." *Monthly Review of the British Council* (October, 1947):155-156.

------. *Report of the British Council 1940-41*. London: British Council, 1941.

------. *Report of the British Council 1942-3*. London: British Council, 1943.

------. *The British Council: Report for 1943-1944*. London: The British Council, 1944.

------. *The British Council: Report for 1945-1946*. London: The British Council, 1946.

------. *The British Council: Report for 1946-1947*. London: The BritishCouncil, 1947

------. *The British Council: Report for 1948-1949*. London: The British Council, 1949.

Boas, Franz. "On Alternating Sounds." *American Anthropologist* 2 (January, 1889): 47-54.

------. "The History of Anthropology." *Science* 20, no. 512 (October 21, 1904): 513-514

-------. "Introductory." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1 no. 1 (July, 1917): 1-8.

-------. "Some Principles of Museum Administration" *Science* 25, no. 650 (June 14, 1907): 921-933.

Brady, Erika. *A Spiral Way: How the Phonograph Changed Ethnography* (Jackson, Miss.: University Press of Mississippi, 1999.

Bush, Ronald. "The Presence of the Past: Ethnographic Thinking/Literary Politics." In *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, ed. Elazar Barkin and Ronald Bush, 23-42. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Camlot, Jason. "Early Talking Books: Spoken Recordings and Recitation

Anthologies, 1880-1920." *Book History* 6 (2003):147-173.

Cavallo, Pietro. "Theatre Politics of the Mussolini Regime and their Influence on Fascist Drama." In *Theatre and War 1933-1945: Performance in Extremis,* edited by Michael Balfour. Translated by Erminia Passannanti and Günter Berghaus, 21-31. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001.

Chinitz, David, ed. *A Companion to T. S. Eliot*. Chichester and Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 2009.

Chinitz, David E. *T. S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Cianci Giovanni and Harding, Jason, eds. *T. S. Eliot and the Concept of Tradition*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Cochrane, Claire. *Twentieth-Century British Theatre: Industry, Art and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Cohen, Debra Rae, Coyle, Michael, and Lewty, Jane. "Introduction: Signing On." In *Broadcasting Modernism*. Edited by Debra Rae Cohen, Michael Coyle and Jane Lewty. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009.

Collini, Stefan. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Collini, Stefan. *Common Reading: Critics, Historians, Publics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Compton, J. "A Library of Recorded English Literature." *Monthly Review of the British Council* (August, 1947): 74-76.

Coyle, Michael. "'This Rather Elusory Broadcast Technique': T. S. Eliot and the Genre of the Radio Talk." *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal Of Short Articles, Notes, And Reviews* 11, no. 4 (1998): 32-42.

Coyle, Michael. "T. S. Eliot on the Air: 'Culture' and the Challenges of Mass Commmunication." In *T. S. Eliot and Our Turning World*, edited by Jewel Spears Brooker, 141-154. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001.

Crowley, Tony. *Standard English and the Politics of Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Dalton, Jack P. "A Letter from T. S. Eliot." *James Joyce Quarterly 6,* no. 1 (Fall, 1968): 79-81.

Dante Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy: Inferno Part 1 Text*. Translated by Charles S. Singleton. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Daniel Glass, Loren. "#$%^&*!?: Modernism and Dirty Words." *Modernism/modernity* 14 (April 2007): 209-223

Davies, Andrew "The War Years." In *Theatre and War 1933-1945: Performance in Extremis*, edited by Michael Balfour, 54-64. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001.

Davis, Alan. *Chivalry and Romance in the English Renaissance*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003.

Defoe, Daniel. *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press*. Oxford: Luttrell Society; Basil Blackwell, 1948.

de Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

Dobranski, Stephen B. *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Donaldson, Frances. *The British Council: The First Fifty Years*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1984.

Duggan, Christopher. *A Concise History of Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Edison, Thomas A. "The Perfected Phonograph." *The North American Review* 146, no. 379 (June, 1888): 641-650.

Eliot, T. S. *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy*. London: Faber and Faber, 1934.

------. *The Aims of Poetic Drama: the Presidential Address to the Poets' Theatre Guild*. London: 1949.

------. "American Literature and the American Language." *The Sewanee Review* 4, no.1 (Winter, 1966): 1-20. Accessed June 24, 2013. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27541381.

------. "The Appreciation of Poetry." *The Critic* 18, no. 5 (April-May, 1960): 13-14, 78-80.

------. "The Approach to James Joyce." *The Listener* 30, no. 770 (October 14, 1943): 446.

------. "Banquet Speech," Nobel Prize. Accessed June 5, 2014. http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1948/eliot speech.html.

------. *The Complete Poems and Plays*. London: Faber and Faber, 2004.

------. "Christianity and Communism." *The Listener* 166 (March 23, 1932): 382-3.

------. "A Commentary." *The Monthly Criterion*: *A Literary Review* 5 (May, 1927: 187-190.

------. “A Commentary.” *The Monthly Criterion: A Literary Review* 6, no. 1 (July 1927): 1-3.

------. “A Commentary.” *The Criterion: A Literary Review* 7 (June, 1928): 289-294.

------. “A Commentary.” *The Criterion* 8, no. 30 (September, 1928): 1-5.

------. “A Commentary.” *The Criterion* 9, no. 35 (January 1930): 228-45.

------. “A Commentary.” *The Criterion: A Literary Review* 10 (April 1931): 481 90.

------. *Dante*. London: Faber and Faber, 1929.

------. “Die Idee Einer Europäischen Gesellschaft” *Hamburger Akademische Rundschau* 3 (1950): 727-738.

------. “‘The Duchess of Malfi’ at the Lyric: and Poetic Drama.” *Art & Letters* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1920): 36-39.

------. “The Elizabethan Grub Street.” *The Listener* 1, no. 23 (June 19, 1929): 853-4.

------. “Elizabethan Travellers’ Tales.” *The Listener* 2, no. 26 (July 10, 1929): 59-60.

------. “Experiment in Criticism.” *The Bookman* (November, 1929): 225-232.

------. *Ezra Pound: His Metric and Poetry*. Project Gutenberg, 2003, part 2. Accessed August 9, 2013. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7275/7275-h/7275-h.htm.

------. “From Poe to Valéry.” *The Hudson Review* 2, no. 3 (Autumn, 1949): 327 342.

------. “The Frontiers of Criticism.” *The Sewanee Review* 64, no. 4 (October December, 1956): 525-543.

------. “The Function of a Literary Review.” *The Criterion* 1 (July, 1923): 421.

------. *Goethe as the Sage*. Hamburg: University of Hamburg, 1955.

------. “Hamlet and his Problems.” *The Athenaeum* (September 26, 1919): 940 941.

------. “Hollow Men.” Performed by T. S. Eliot. Recorded May 13, 1947 as a Morris Gray Poetry Reading. T. *S. Eliot Reading The Waste Land, Four Quartets, and Other Poems*. Harper Collins, 2005.

------. Introduction to *Leisure The Basis of Culture*, by Josef Pieper. Translated by Alexander Dru, 11-17. London: Faber and Faber, 1952.

------. Introduction to *Seneca. His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English*, vol.1, edited by Thomas Newton, v-liv. London: Constable and Co. Ltd.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

------. "In Memory of Henry James." *The Egoist* 5, no. 1 (January, 1918): 1-2.

------. "Last Words." *The Criterion* XVIII, no. 71 (January, 1939): 271-2.

------. "The Lesson of Baudelaire." *The Tyro* 1 (April, 1921): 4.

------. *The Letters of T. S. Eliot.* Edited by Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton. Vol. 1, 1898-1922 revised edition. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.

------. *The Letters of T. S. Eliot.* Edited by Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton. Vol. 2, 1923-1925. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.

------. *The Letters of T. S. Eliot.* Edited by Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden. Vol. 3, 1926-1927. London: Faber and Faber, 2012.

------. *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*. Edited by Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden. Vol. 4, 1928-1929. London: Faber and Faber, 2013.

------.. *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*. Edited by Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden. Vol. 5, 1930-1931. London: Faber and Faber, 2014.

------. "Literature and the American Courts." *The Egoist* 5, no. 3 (March 1918): 39.

------. "The Music of Poetry." In *On Poetry and Poets*, 26-38. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

------. "The Modern Dilemma: Christianity and Communism." *Listener* 7 (March 16, 1932): 383.

------. "The Nature of Cultural Relations." In *Friendship, Progress, Civilisation: Three War-time Speech to the Anglo-Swedish Society.* Holborn, London: Anglo-Swedish Society, 1943.

------. "A Neglected Aspect of Chapman", ed. Anthony Cuda and Ronald Schuchard. *The New York Review of Books,* November 7, 2013. Accessed 23 February, 2014. http://0-www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/nov/07/neglected aspect-chapman/html.

------. "Notes on the Way." *Time and Tide* 16 (January 26, 1935): 118, 120-1.

------. *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. London: Faber and Faber, 1962.

------. "Observations." *The Egoist* 5 (May 1918): 69-70.

------. *Poetry and Drama.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.

------. "Poets' Borrowings." *Times Literary Supplement* (April 5, 1928): 255.

------. "The Poets' Translation Series I-VI." *Poetry* 9, no.2 (November, 1916): 101-2.

------. "Preface" to *Anabasis*. Saint-John Perse. Translated by T. S. Eliot, 8. London: Faber and Faber, 1930.

------. [unsigned]. "*President Wilson, His Problems and His Policy*: *An English View*, by H. Wilson Harris." *The New Statesman* 9 (May 12, 1917):140.

------. "Religion and Science: a Phantom Dilemma." *The Listener* 7 (March 23, 1932): 428-9.

------. "The Romantic Generation, if it Existed." *The Athenauem* (July 18, 1919): 616-617.

------. *The Sacred Wood*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

------. "The Search for Moral Sanction." *The Listener* 168 (March 30, 1932): 445-6, 480.

------. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1953.

------. "The Social Function of Poetry." In *On Poetry and Poets,* 15-25. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

------. "Song to the Opherian." *The Tyro* 1 (April, 1921): 6.

------. "The Three Provincialities." *Tyro* 2 (1922): 11-13.

------. "Tradition and the Practice of Poetry." In *T. S. Eliot. Essays from the* Southern Review, edited by James Olney, 10-20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

------ and Hall, Donald. "T. S. Eliot, The Art of Poetry No. 1." *The Paris Review* 21 Spring-Summer, 1959). Accessed June 9, 2014. http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4738/the-art-of-poetry-no-1t-seliot.

------. "T. S. Eliot talks about his poetry." *Columbia University Forum* (Fall 1958): 11-14.

------. "The Tudor Biographers." *The Listener* 2, no.27 (July 17, 1929): 94-95.

------. *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*. London: Faber and Faber, 1964.

------. *To Criticize the Critic and Other Writings*. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.

------. "War-Paint and Feathers." *The Athenaeum* (October 17, 1919): 1036.

------. “Wilkie Collins and Dickens.” *The Times Literary Supplement* (August 4, 1927): 525.

Ellmann, Maud. “Joyce’s Noises.” *Modernism/modernity* 16, no. 2. (April 2009): 383-390; Margot Norris, “The Music of Joyce’s Vernacular Voices.” *Modernism/modernity* 16, no. 2 (April 2009): 377-382.

Everding, Robert G. “Shaw and the Popular Context.” In *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw,* edited by Christopher Innes, 309-333. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Feather, John. “From Rights In Copies to Copyright: The Recognition of Authors’ Rights in English Law and Practice in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.” In Woodmansee and Jaszi, 191-210.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter. “On the Use of the Phonograph in the Study of the Language of American Indians.” *Science* 15, no. 378 (May 2, 1890): 267-269.

Fink, Carole. “The Peace Settlement, 1919-1939.” In *A Companion to World War I*, edited by John Horne, 544-566. Chichester and New Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2010. Accessed 29 March, 2014. http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=254828.

Furr, Derek. *Recorded Poetry and Poetic Reception from Edna Millay to the Circle of Robert Lowell*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Gertzman, Jay A. “Not Quite Honest: Samuel Roth's "Unauthorized" Ulysses and the 1927 International Protest.” *Joyce Studies Annual* (2009): 34-66.

Gillespie, Stuart. *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Goble, Mark. *Beautiful Circuits: Modernism and Mediated Life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Goldman, Jonathan. *Modernism is the Literature of Celebrity* . Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 2011.

Gordon, Lyndall. *Eliot’s Early Years*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Golston, Michael. *Rhythm and Race in Modernist Poetry and Science*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Grace, Alan. *This is the British Forces Network: The Story of Forces Broadcasting in Germany*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1996.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*.Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Greet, William Cabell. "A Phonographic Expedition to Williamsburg, Virginia." *American Speech* 6, no. 3 (February, 1931): 161-172.

Grimble, Simon. "Englishness." In Harding, *T. S. Eliot in Context*, 43-51.

Hall, Jason David. "Mechanized Metrics: From Verse Science to Laboratory Prosody, 1880-1918." *Configurations* 17 (Fall, 2009): 285-308.

Harding, Jason. *The* Criterion: *Cultural Politics and Periodical Networks in Inter-War Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

------. 2009. "Keeping Critical Thought Alive: Eliot's Editorship of the *Criterion*." In Chinitz, 388-398.

------. 2011. *T. S. Eliot in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------. 2012. "T. S. Eliot's Shakespeare." *Essays in Criticism* 62, no. 2: 174. Accessed May 25, 2014. http://dx.doi:10.1093/escrit/cgs005.

Harris, Michael. "Introduction." In *The Press in English Society form the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, edited by Michael Harris, 107-112. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1986.

Hegeman, Susan. *Patterns for American: Modernism and the Concept of Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Hibbitt, George W. "Phonograph Recordings of Poets' Readings." *The English Journal* 25 (June, 1936): 479-481.

Hilmes, Michele. *Radio Voices: American Broadcasting, 1922-1952*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997

Hobhouse, L. T. Liberalism. London: Williams and Norgate, 1919.

Hofer, Matthew. "Education." In *Ezra Pound in Context*, edited Ira B. Nadel, 75-105. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Howarth, Herbert. "T. S. Eliot's Criterion: The Editor and His Contributors." *Comparative Literature*11, no. 2 (Spring, 1959): 97-110.

Hutchinson, Elizabeth. *The Indian Craze: Primitivism, Modernism, and Transculturism in American Art, 1890-1915.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2009.

Jaffe, Aaron. *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005

Jay, Gregory S. "Discovering the Corpus." In *T. S. Eliot's* The Waste Land, edited by Harold Bloom, 75-94. New York: Chelsea House, 2007.

Kahn, Douglas. "Introduction. Histories of Sound Once Removed." In *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*. Edited by Douglas Kahn

and Gregory Whitehead, 1-29. Cambridge, Mass., London: The MIT Press, 1992.

Kendon, Frank. "Poetry and Broadcasting." *The Radio Times* 24 (July 5, 1929): 1, 8.

Kennedy, Dennis. "British theatre, 1895-1946: art, entertainment, audiences – an introduction." In *The Cambridge History of British Theatre,* edited by Baz Kershaw, 3-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Keynes, John Maynard. *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920.

Kittler, Friedrich A. *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter.* Translated and Introduction by Geoffrey Winthrop-Young and Michael Wutz. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Knowles, Sebastian D. G. "Death by Gramophone." *Journal of Modern Literature* 27 (Fall 2003): 1-13.

Kreilkamp, Ivan. *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Lawrence, W. J. "The Mystery of the *Hamlet* First Quarto." *The Monthly Criterion* 5, no. 2 (May, 1927): 191-201.

Lawrence, "The Pirates of 'Hamlet.'" *The Criterion* 8, no. 33 (July, 1929): 642-646.

Levenson, Michael. "The Role of Intellectual." In Harding, *T. S. Eliot in Context*, 63-72.

Mackay, Marina. *Modernism and World War II.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Mahieu, D. L. *The Rise of Modern Commercial Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Manganaro, Marc. *Culture 19*22: The Emergence of a Concept. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Marshall, Alan. "England and Nowhere." In *The Cambridge Companion to T. S. Eliot*, edited by A. David Moody, 94-107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Marshik, Celia. *British Modernism and Censorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Martin, Meredith. *The Rise and Fall of Meter: Poetry and English National Culture, 1860-1930.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Materer, Timothy. *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn 1915-1924.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1991.

Matthews, Steven. *T. S. Eliot and Early Modern Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Mauriello, Christopher E. "The Strange Death of the Public Intellectual: Liberal Intellectual Identity and the 'Field of Cultural Production' in England, 1880 1920." *Journal of Victorian Culture* 6, no. 1 (2001): 1-26. Accessed May 13, 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/jvc.2001.6.1.1.

McDonald, Gail. *Learning to be Modern: Pound, Eliot, and the American University.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

McGill, Meredith L. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

McKerrow, Ronald B. *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Introduction by David McKitterick. Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies; New Castle and Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 1994.

Middleton, Peter. *Distant Reading: Performance, Readership, and Consumption in Contemporary Poetry*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2005.

Miller, James Edwin. *T. S. Eliot: The Making of an American Poet, 1888-1922.* Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.

Miller, Joshua. *Accented America: The Cultural Politics of Multilingual Modernism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Moody, A. David. *T. S. Eliot: Poet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

------. "T. S. Eliot: The American Strain." In *The Placing of T. S. Eliot,* edited by Jewel Spears Brooker, 77-89. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991.

Morrison, Mark S. "Performing the Pure Voice: Elocution, Verse Recitation, and Modernist Poetry in Prewar London." *Modernism/Modernity* 3.3. (1996): 25 50.

Morgan Ayres, Harry and Cabell Greet, William. "American Speech Records at Columbia University." *American Speech* 5, no. 5 (June, 1930): 333-358.

Narizny, Kevin. *The Political Economy of Grand Strategy.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Norris, Margot. "The Music of Joyce's Vernacular Voices." *Modernism/modernity* 16, no. 2 (April 2009): 377-382.

North, Michael. "The Dialect in/of Modernism: Pound and Eliot's Racial Masquerade." *American Literary History* 4, no. 1 (Spring, 1992): 56-76. Accessed June 24, 2013. http://www.jstor.org/stable/489936.

North, Michael. *The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literarture*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Methuen, 1982.

Oser, Lee. *T. S. Eliot and American Poetry*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1998

Packard, Josephine. "A Discography of the Harvard Vocarium." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 15, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter, 2005): 3-131.

Patterson, Anita. *Race, American Literature and Transnational Modernisms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Paty, Caroline. "T. S. Eliot and the text of anthropology." In Cianci and Harding, 161 174.

Payne, Stanley G. *Civil War in Europe, 1905-1949*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Pease, Allison. *Modernism, Mass Culture, and the Aesthetics of Obscenity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Pettegree, Andrew. *The Book in the Renaissance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010.

Picker, John M. *Victorian Soundscapes.* Oxford: OUP, 2003.

Pollard, Alfred. *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text*. London: Alexander Moring Limited, 1917.

Pollnitz, Christopher. "The Censorship and Transmission of D. H. Lawrence's Pansies: The Home Office and the 'Foul-Mouthed Fellow'." *Journal of Modern Literature* 28 (Spring 2005): 44-71

Potter, Rachel. "Censorship." In Harding (2011), 83-92.

Pound, Ezra. "Copyright and Tariff." *The New Age* (October 3, 1918): 303-4.

------. *Ezra Pound: Selected Poems*. Edited by T. S. Eliot. London: Faber and Gwyer, 1928.

------. "The Classics 'Escape." *The Little Review* 5, no. 2 (March 1918): 34

------. *The Spirit of Romance*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1910.

Price, Roger. *A Concise History of France*, 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Prins, Yopie. "Voice Inverse." *Victorian Poetry* 42, no. 1 (Spring, 2004): 43-60.

Putnam, George Haven. "Copyright." In *The Encyclopedia Britannica. Fourteenth Edition. Vol. 6. "Olebrooke to Damascus"*. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1929.

Rainey, Lawrence. *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture.* New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998.

------. *Revisiting* The Waste Land. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.

Rhodes, Chip. *Structures of the Jazz Age. Mass culture, progressive education, and racial disclosures in American modernism*. London and New York: Verso, 1998.

Richards, I. A. "Basic English and its Applications." In *C. K. Ogden and Linguistics*. Vol. 1., ed. W. Terrence Gordon, 13-36. London: Routledge/Thoemmes Press, 1994.

Ricketson, Sam. *The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works: 1886-1986*. London: Centre for Commercial Law Studies, 1987.

Ricks, Christopher. *T. S. Eliot and Prejudice*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.

Robertson, Craig. *The Passport in America: The History of a Document*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Rose, Jonathan, "Modernity and Print I: Britain 1890-1970." In *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose, 341-353. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Rose, Mark. *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Rust, Marion. "'An Entire New Work'?: Abridgment and Plagiarism in Early U.S. Print Culture." *Studies in American Fiction* 38 (Spring and Fall, 2011):139 162.

Sagna Buurma, Rachel. "Anonymity, Corporate Authority, and the Archive: The Production of Authorship in Late-Victorian England". *Victorian Studies* 50 (Autumn 2007): 15-42.

Salter, Mark B. *Rights of Passage: The Passport in International Relations*. Colorado and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003.

Saunders, Max. "T. S. Eliot and Ford Madox Ford." In Cianci and Harding, 185-200.

Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual: the Reith Lectures*. New York: First Vintage Books, 1996.

Saint-Amour, Paul K. *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003.

------, ed. *Modernism and Copyright*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Schuchard, Ronald. "T. S. Eliot at Fabers: Book Reports, Blurbs, Young Poets." *Areté* (Summer/Autumn 2007): 63-87.

Scott, Thomas L. and Friedman, Melvin J., eds. *Pound/The Little Review: The Letters of Ezra Pound to Margaret Anderson:* The Little Review *Correspondence*. London: Faber and Faber, 1988.

Sherry, Vincent. *The Great War and the Language of Modernism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Sieburth, Richard. "The Sound of Pound: A Listener's Guide." *Penn Sound* . 2007. Accessed August 12, 2013.http://writing.upenn.edu/pennsound/x/text/Sieburth Richard_Pound.html#_ednref4.

Spears Brooker, Jewel, ed. *T. S. Eliot and Our Turning World.* Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001.

Spoo, Robert. "Copyright Protectionism and Its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's 'Ulysses' In America." *The Yale Law Journal* (December 1998): 633-667.

Sterne, Jonathan. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2003

------. "Preserving Sound in Modern America." In *Hearing History: A Reader*, edited by Mark Michael Smith, 296-318. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2004.

Stonor Saunders, Frances. *Who Paid the Piper: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta Books, 2000.

Streeter, Thomas. "Broadcast Copyright and the Bureaucratization of Property." In Woodmansee and Jaszi, 303-326.

Strobl, Gerwin. *The Swastika and the Stage: German Theatre and Society, 1933 1945.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Suárez, Juan A. "'The Waste Land', the Gramophone, and the Modernist Discourse Network." *New Literary History* 32 (Summer, 2001): 747-768.

Suisman, David and Strasser, Susan, eds. Sound in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Sweeney, Carole. *From Fetish to Subject: Race, Modernism, and Primitivism, 1919 1935.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2004.

Tetel Andresen, Julie. *Linguistics in America 1769-1924: A Critical History.* London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Vaughan, Alden T. "Sir Walter Ralegh's Indian Interpreters, 1584-1618." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 59 (April 2002): 341-376.

Vincent, David. *The Culture of Secrecy: Britain, 1832-1998.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

------. *Literacy and Popular Culture*. *England 1750-1914.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Wilkinson, James D. *The Intellectual Resistance in Europe.* Boston, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Williams, Keith. *British Writers and the Media 1930-45.* Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1996.

Woodmansee, Martha and Jaszi, Peter eds. *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994.

Woolf, Virginia. "'Anon' and 'The Reader': Virginia Woolf's Last Essays," edited by Brenda Silver, *Twentieth-Century Literature* 25, no. 3/4 (Fall-Winter): 356 441.